

By Mr. AUF DER HEIDE: A bill (H. R. 3976) granting a pension to Charles H. Rice; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3977) granting an increase of pension to Jane A. Stanton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 3978) granting a pension to Dick Rutledge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3979) granting a pension to James J. Potvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: A bill (H. R. 3980) granting a pension to Andrew J. Adair; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FREEMAN: A bill (H. R. 3981) granting an increase of pension to Lila M. Studley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3982) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3983) granting an increase of pension to Debbie E. Casey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GUYER: A bill (H. R. 3984) granting a pension to Amanda M. Case; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3985) granting a pension to Kate Bartholomew; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3986) granting a pension to Fannie Neff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3987) granting a pension to Margaret Tenpenny; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3988) granting a pension to Julia Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3989) granting a pension to Effie R. Brooks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3990) granting a pension to Joseph H. Carson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3991) granting a pension to Laura M. Cooper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3992) granting an increase of pension to Augusta Redfield Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3993) granting an increase of pension to Mary Walden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3994) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Teel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3995) granting an increase of pension to Anna C. Mayer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3996) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Skidmore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3997) granting an increase of pension to Ellen Bauswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3998) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Meador; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 3999) granting an increase of pension to Louesa M. Cochran; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HALSEY: A bill (H. R. 4000) granting an increase of pension to Mary P. McIntire; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAMMER: A bill (H. R. 4001) granting an increase of pension to Cassandra Jarrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOUSTON of Delaware: A bill (H. R. 4002) granting an increase of pension to Julia W. Simpson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HUGHES: A bill (H. R. 4003) granting a pension to Dora Hupp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4004) granting an increase of pension to Sarah L. Pyles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Indiana: A bill (H. R. 4005) granting an increase of pension to Mitylene Gunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 4006) granting a pension to Samuel L. Poe; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4007) granting an increase of pension to Percis Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 4008) granting a pension to James R. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKS: A bill (H. R. 4009) for the relief of the Summit Land Co.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PORTER (by request): A bill (H. R. 4010) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States and of Elise Steiniger, housekeeper for Consul R. A. Wallace Treat at the Smyrna consulate, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of Government funds and/or personal property by reason of theft, warlike conditions, catastrophes of nature, shipwreck, or other causes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 4011) granting an increase of pension to Lydia J. Cole; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 4012) granting an increase of pension to Cella Foot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE: A bill (H. R. 4013) for the relief of William F. Campbell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WILLIAMSON: A bill (H. R. 4014) granting a pension to Isabel M. Furlong; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

660. Petition of the Carpet, Linoleum, and Tile Workers Local, No. 1, asking Congress for a reduction of 50 per cent in the Federal tax on incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

661. By Mr. BAIRD: Petition of Civil War veterans resident in the Ohio Soldiers' and Sailors' Home, Erie County, Ohio, asking increased pensions for surviving veterans and the widows of veterans; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

662. By Mr. BLOOM: Petition of the board of directors of the Merchants' Association of New York, approving the principles announced by President Hoover in opposition to the proposed export debenture plan of relief, and urging that such plan be not enacted into law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

663. By Mr. BOYLAN: Communication from Mr. Arthur Gran, of the American Colortype Co., 207 West Twenty-fifth Street, New York, protesting against increased tariff on casein; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

664. By Mrs. KAHN: Petition of Native Sons of the Golden West, of California, urging the passage of the Englebright bill, providing that September 9 of each year be a legal holiday for the Federal employees in the State of California; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

665. Also, petition of the Native Sons of the Golden West, of California, urging appropriations for the prevention of forest fires as provided in the Englebright bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

666. Also, petition of the Native Sons of the Golden West, of California, urging Congress to prohibit further entrance of Filipinos for permanent settlement in the United States; also urging Congress to provide for apprehension and deportation of violators of the immigration laws from Mexico to those who are ineligible to citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

667. By Mr. JONAS of North Carolina: Petition of sundry citizens of Celo, N. C., praying for the passage of Civil War pension bill in this special session of Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

668. By Mr. SPEAKS: Evidence in support of House bill 3961, granting an increase of pension to Flora A. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

MONDAY, June 17, 1929

Rev. Joseph R. Sizoo, D. D., minister of the New York Avenue Presbyterian Church of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

Gracious and eternal Father, accept our thanks for the light of a new day, for the blessings of home and health, and for the privilege of serving the Nation. Ordain to us for another day Thy watchful providence to guard against all sickness and peril; Thy wise counsel to guide into every right thought and word; Thy sufficient grace to defend from all temptation of wrong; and Thy atoning love to cover all our sins. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Friday last, when, on request of Mr. JONES and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haltigan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 1453) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges, and for other purposes, with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 3671) to authorize and direct a survey to be made of the Escambia River and its tributaries, Alabama and Florida, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PRINT PAPER FROM CORN AND COTTON STALKS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting, in re-

sponse to Senate Resolution 61 (by Mr. HEFLIN, agreed to May 16, 1929), information relative to the making of print paper from cotton stalks, corn stalks, and other material, which, with the accompanying documents, was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

CLAIM OF WILLIAM K. KENNEDY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, his report and recommendation concerning the claim of William K. Kennedy, customs agent, El Paso, Tex., in the sum of \$612.49, for salary and expenses incident to transporting three Federal prisoners from the Philippine Islands to the United States marshal at San Francisco, Calif., in the year 1921, which was referred to the Committee on Claims.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—VOTE ON FARM RELIEF CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, on last Friday, on the final vote on the adoption of the conference report on the farm relief bill, I was absent. I was absent on account of the assurance given me by the chairman of the committee, the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY], that there would be no vote on the question on that day. But for that assurance, I should have been present to have voted on the adoption of the conference report. I wish the RECORD to show that if I had been present I would have voted "yea" on the final adoption of the conference report.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I can not let the opportunity go by without saying that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture never gave any assurance whatever in regard to the matter referred to by the Senator from Kentucky, but he gave it as his best judgment that there would be no vote on the question until Saturday, because, under the House rules, usually a conference report must go over for a day for printing. But on this particular occasion unanimous consent was given for the immediate consideration of the conference report in the House, and there was nothing that the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry could do to prevent a vote in the Senate on the adoption of the conference report on Friday.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I am not complaining of the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am merely explaining the reason why I was not here when the vote was taken and why I did not vote for the adoption of the conference report.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate resolutions adopted by the San Francisco Funeral Directors Association and Local Union No. 1, Carpet, Linoleum, and Tile Workers, of San Francisco, both in the State of California, favoring a reduction of 50 per cent in the Federal tax on earned incomes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also laid before the Senate a memorial of sundry citizens of Clinton and vicinity, in the State of Oklahoma, protesting against revision of the present calendar unless a proviso be included definitely guaranteeing the preservation of the continuity of the weekly cycle without the insertion of blank days, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE presented the following joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, which was referred to the Committee on Immigration:

STATE OF WISCONSIN.

Joint Resolution 70, A

No. —, 1929

Joint resolution relating to the repeal of the national-origins provision of the Federal immigration law

Whereas the so-called national-origins provision of the Federal immigration law will go into effect July 1, 1929, unless repealed, suspended, or modified prior thereto; and

Whereas this national-origins provision will greatly reduce the number of immigrants who can be admitted from Germany, Ireland, and the Scandinavian countries, the quota for Germany being reduced from 51,227 to 29,957, the quota for the Irish Free State from 28,567 to 17,853, and the quota for the three Scandinavian countries—Norway, Denmark, and Sweden—from 18,808 to 6,872, while, in contrast, the quota for Great Britain and the north of Ireland is increased from 34,007 to 65,721; and

Whereas this national-origins provision is a great injustice to all American citizens of German, Irish, and Scandinavian descent who for three centuries have helped to build the Nation in times of peace and to defend it in times of war; and

Whereas President Hoover, recognizing the injustice of this provision, has recommended to Congress the repeal of the national-origins clause of the immigration law, and action upon this recommendation must be

taken at the present special session of Congress if it is to be effective: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Legislature of Wisconsin hereby again memorializes the Congress of the United States to promptly enact legislation to repeal the national-origins provision of the Federal immigration law; be it further

Resolved, That properly attested copies of this resolution be sent to both Houses of Congress and each Wisconsin Member thereof.

IMPORT OF FOREIGN OIL

Mr. PINE. Mr. President, I present a letter from the Hon. John L. Lewis, president of the United Mine Workers of America, advocating a tariff on foreign-produced petroleum oil imported into the United States. I ask unanimous consent that the letter may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Indianapolis, Ind., June 8, 1929.

Hon. W. B. PINE,

United States Senator, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: As president of the United Mine Workers of America, and speaking for that organization, I earnestly urge upon the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States Congress the vital necessity of a tariff on the import of foreign-produced petroleum oil imported into the United States. And I request that in the preparation of a tariff law, a task with which Congress is now engaged, you provide for such tariff on oil. This action will be in the best interests of the general public of the United States, because it will aid very greatly in affording employment for many thousands of now idle men in the coal-producing industry, thus enabling these men to earn a living for themselves and their families.

The free importation of cheap oil from foreign countries into the United States has had a depressing effect upon American-produced coal, and we see no good reason why this great, vital, fundamental American industry should be thus penalized in favor of foreign industry and foreign labor. There is no question but that consumption of many millions of tons of coal have been displaced by the use of oil produced in the United States. This of itself has done vast injury to the coal industry. To permit the continued free entry of many more millions of barrels of foreign oil simply means still further shrinkage in the consumption of American coal and the wrecking of this great American industry. Just how this thing works will be made clear when I point out that the 431,067,000 barrels of fuel oil used in the United States in 1927 displaced 110,000,000 tons of coal, or approximately 20 per cent of the normal output of American coal mines. Even this displacement was so disastrous as to close a vast number of mines and to throw many thousands of mine workers out of employment. And now, if this Government permits the continued free entry of foreign-produced oil, it will mean the closing down of more mines and the unemployment of more thousands of men.

When hundreds of thousands—aye, millions—of men are out of work, as is the case at present, there must necessarily follow a slump in business and commerce of the country. These men, with no opportunity to earn a living, have no money to spend. They can not buy the products of mills, factories, and shops. They can not trade with local merchants and business men. Consequently the entire business and industrial structure of our country suffers from business depression. Especially is this true in those countless communities, once prosperous but now practically bankrupt, where coal mines either are wholly idle or operating but a few hours a week, and where the earnings of coal-mine workers have shrunk almost entirely if not altogether to the vanishing point. Coal is produced in 30 States and these conditions exist in each and every one of these 30 States. We contend that Congress should not take any step that would further aggravate this intolerable condition, and this is what would happen if foreign oil were given continued entry free of tariff duty into the United States.

We contend further that it is the duty of Congress to protect the interests of American labor rather than that of foreign labor. Americans are not employed to any appreciable extent in the production of oil in foreign countries. Wages paid for labor performed in the production of oil in those foreign countries go to inhabitants of those countries. They receive American money for producing oil that would be shipped duty free into the United States and throw thousands more American workmen out of employment. There would be no justice in such a plan from the standpoint of the best interests of the American public. On the other hand, an adequate tariff on foreign oil, whether it comes from Mexico, South America, or anywhere else, would strengthen the demand for American oil and American coal for fuel purposes in this country, and it would mean employment, earning power, food, clothing, shelter, education, and progress for countless thousands of good, loyal American citizens. It would mean a revival of the coal industry, now so near to the industrial graveyard. It would mean improvement in industry, trade, commerce, and transportation. It

would mean more business for the merchants and business men of the 30 coal-producing States. I may state it clearly as our position that these considerations far outweigh any benefit that could possibly accrue to the people of the United States by permitting foreign oil to enter this country duty free.

Our understanding of the matter is that tariff duties are levied for two purposes, viz, to raise revenue for the Government and to protect American industry and American labor from the destructive competition of pauper wages paid to labor in many foreign countries. I do not hesitate to say that Congress can find no other American industry that needs this kind of protection to-day more than does the fuel industry.

Therefore, in the name of the United Mine Workers of America, and in behalf of American labor, I again earnestly urge that Congress levy an adequate tariff duty on the import of foreign oil into the United States.

Very truly yours,

JOHN L. LEWIS, *President.*

SHOOTING AT FORT BAYARD VETERANS' HOSPITAL, NEW MEXICO

Mr. BRATTON. I present a telegram from representatives of certain veterans' organizations at the Veterans' Bureau hospital at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., relating to certain press dispatches concerning an incident involving a shooting at Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital in connection with the enforcement of the prohibition law, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Finance and printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegram was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FORT BAYARD, N. MEX., June 15, 1929.

HON. SAM G. BRATTON,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

Albuquerque Journal carries Associated Press item dated Washington, June 13, stating Prohibition Commissioner Doran Thursday announced he had received a report of the shooting at Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital of J. J. Thompson, alleged bootlegger, by prohibition agents. He further states his capture was a result of a drive by prohibition agents to prevent bootleggers from selling whisky in the vicinity of Fort Bayard Veterans' Hospital. This shooting occurred at Hanover, a mining town approximately 10 miles from Fort Bayard and had no connections with this hospital. Investigation has been made and we can not find that Thompson has ever been on this reservation. Realizing that the Director of the Veterans' Bureau is anxious to close this hospital, and fearing this false report released by the Prohibition Commissioner will be to our detriment, we are earnestly requesting that you condemn the Prohibition Department for this unfair report on our hospital. The patients and personnel of this hospital resent the stigma placed upon us by this erroneous publicity through the Associated and United Press given them by the Prohibition Department.

CHRIS A. WEROS,

Commander American Legion.

FRANK SMITH,

United States Spanish War Veterans.

FREDERIC VILLIO,

Commander Veterans' Foreign Wars.

ALBER MORIARTY,

Commander Disabled War Veterans.

THE MEDITERRANEAN FRUIT FLY

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I present a couple of brief editorials regarding the Mediterranean fruit fly; also a communication and resolution upon that subject from the National Canners Association. I ask that they may be printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred.

There being no objection, the editorials, communication, and resolution were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Gainesville (Fla.) Sun of June 8, 1929]

THE RIGHT ANGLE

In making a plea to the authorities in Washington for compensation to Florida growers to reimburse them for crops destroyed in the fruit-fly eradication work, members of the Florida delegation stressed the fact that indemnities should properly be considered a part of the eradication plan. From a legal standpoint perhaps there might be some question about that, but from a psychological and moral basis there can be no contrary arguments whatever.

Compensation, if it is finally enacted, is more or less of a necessary evil. It is not to be considered as charity in any sense of the word. Growers whose crops are destroyed will have suffered much more loss than if they had been allowed to market them, especially next year, when there is bound to be a short crop and good prices. And the amount which Congress is expected to set aside for this purpose will not begin to cover the economic losses sustained by this State in the way of actual losses to growers, packers, carriers, and allied interests—to

say nothing of depreciated properties, depreciated land values, etc., which can be computed only in terms of scores of millions of dollars.

All of which loss is readily and cheerfully borne by Florida in the war to exterminate this pest—a pest which merely happened to stage its first serious outbreak in Florida—in order that the other States might be saved similar losses and sacrifices. Ten million dollars is little enough to enable these growers to maintain their groves on a normal basis, to say nothing of possible profits. The fly has got to go, and compensation will greatly aid its flight to other climes.

[From the Fort Myers (Fla.) Press of June 13, 1929]

GROWER INDEMNITIES NEEDED NOW

If Congress in enacting legislation for indemnities to Florida fruit and truck growers makes similar State appropriations mandatory, the Federal relief will become inoperative. Both Congress and the administration regard the Mediterranean fruit-fly infestations as a national menace. This has been borne out by the attitude toward the original outbreak and the eradication measures adopted to date. If that be true, compensation is also a Federal responsibility, although there is a marked tendency in Washington to make the contemplated appropriations contingent on the State's ability to go 50-50.

If reimbursement by the Federal Government was contingent upon Florida's willingness to stand half of the expense, it might be a different matter. Florida's spirit is willing, but the pocketbook is weak. This State is having a difficult time trying to raise enough funds to maintain its credit standing and to meet serious tax delinquencies. Right now it is in the midst of an extra session of the legislature, called for the sole purpose of finding ways and means to conduct State affairs on a most rigid economy basis. To match Federal appropriations running into the millions is out of the question right now. Nevertheless the compensation is an immediate and vital necessity.

However, the National Government may be assured that Florida is prepared to make whatever sacrifices are necessary to cope with its most serious economic problem—the fruit-fly invasion of the United States. It would seem an act of gracious consideration for Florida, as well as one of expediency in meeting a national issue, if the Federal authorities would release their part of the indemnity funds without forcing the State to guarantee its share first.

Florida realizes that it is up against a serious situation. Losses attributable to the fruit fly will affect every citizen in the State, regardless of his occupation. The pest will cost this Commonwealth millions upon millions of dollars, directly and indirectly. The growers whose crops are destroyed or quarantined out of regular market channels will be the biggest direct losers, even if they are compensated sufficiently to maintain their investment. We believe that everybody in the State realizes this and is prepared to fight it out no matter what the cost. And if the Federal Government will not make our immediate cash participation absolute, Florida will find a way to meet its part of the obligation.

NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION,

Washington, D. C., June 5, 1929.

HON. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington.

DEAR SENATOR FLETCHER: I am inclosing herewith copy of a resolution which was passed by the board of directors of the National Canners Association at its meeting in Washington on May 23.

It is the desire of our association to assist in every possible way in helping the legislation which you have introduced to reimburse the Florida Fruit Growers for crops destroyed in furtherance of the Government's eradication program.

Very truly yours,

FRANK E. GORRELL, *Secretary.*

Mr. Preston McKinney presented the problem of the Mediterranean fruit fly infestation in Florida. On motion of Mr. Preston McKinney, the board of directors adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas within the last few weeks the Mediterranean fruit fly, a major pest, has for the first time been found in the continental United States; and

"Whereas, if permitted to spread, it will do tremendous damage to canning crops, both fruits and vegetables; and

"Whereas our Federal Government and the government and people of Florida have united in a thoroughgoing campaign of extermination: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That it is the sense of this meeting that the Federal Government and the State of Florida be upheld and supported in every proper way in this important work; and be it further

"Resolved, That should the United States Department of Agriculture and the Florida authorities conclude that, in fairness to the growers and as a part of the necessary means of extermination, reparation be paid for a part of the losses necessarily sustained by growers, we urge the Congress, the Bureau of the Budget, and the President to provide the necessary funds for such purpose, as well as any additional funds which may from time to time be required for work of extermination and for the work of thorough research; and be it further

"Resolved, That we heartily commend the determined spirit and ability of Dr. Charles L. Marlatt, Chief of the Plant Quarantine and Control Administration of the United States Department of Agriculture, and Dr. Wilmon Newell, of the State Plant Board of Florida, in their important battle; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all parties at interest, including the Members of the Congress."

INTERNATIONAL RADIO CONFERENCE

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably with an amendment the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 102) making an appropriation for expenses of participation by the United States in the meeting of the International Technical Consulting Committee on Radio Communications, to be held at The Hague in September, 1929; and I ask unanimous consent for its consideration. I wish that it may be passed at the present time, so it can be sent to the House immediately.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Let the joint resolution be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be read for the information of the Senate.

The Chief Clerk read the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I have no objection.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I have no objection to its immediate consideration, but I want to ask a question or two about the amount of the appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. I understand the Senator does not object to its present consideration?

Mr. DILL. I do not object, but, as I said, I wish to ask some questions. The Senator said it had to be passed immediately, but I desire to ask a question nevertheless.

Mr. WARREN. Very well.

Mr. DILL. I understand the report of the committee cuts the recommendation of the Bureau of the Budget from \$35,000 to \$20,000. Is that correct?

Mr. WARREN. It was reduced in the committee after investigation showing, so far as we went, that it was more money than would be needed for the purpose. It was stated before the committee that they desired \$14,000 or more for shipping and \$500 for railroad, and so forth, and upon investigation it was found the contracts could be made with the ships and with the railroads for a very much smaller amount. My desire is, since objection was made as to the amount, to have it passed with the amendment which we have reported and let it go to the House and see whether the amount should, in their opinion, be restored to the original sum or remain as it is, or that some point be agreed upon between the two figures.

Mr. DILL. I want to say to the Senator that the convention is a very important matter to the future rights of the United States in international radio. Upon the decision of the convention will depend largely the number of wave lengths to which this Government and this country will be entitled under the international arrangement for use for international purposes. I think we should be very careful not to limit the number of experts going there in such a manner as to hinder the work of those who will be there representing this country in presenting our case fully.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from North Carolina?

Mr. DILL. Certainly.

Mr. OVERMAN. Surely there will not be 13 experts needed to take the trip and discuss radio. We thought to send 13 men there, some of them merely on a pleasure trip, as so frequently happens in cases of this kind, would be unnecessary. Half a dozen men, in our opinion, would be sufficient. Thirteen men carrying over \$2,000 apiece would only be \$26,000, and the committee could not see why they needed \$35,000 to travel in a matter of this kind to The Hague. I hope the Senate will agree to the amendment which we have reported, cutting the appropriation from \$35,000 to \$20,000.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, I do not want to make any fight about it. I only want to impress upon the Senate the importance of the convention, and to impress also of how little moment are a few thousand dollars when we consider that we are making a presentation of our case to secure wave lengths for international communication probably for many years to come. If the committee thinks that \$20,000 is enough and will go into conference with the House ready to listen to representations that may be made and to raise the amount again if the representations are sufficiently convincing, I shall not object further. But I wanted to call the attention of the Senate to the conven-

tion because of its importance to the future of international radio.

I am not going to offer any amendments or to interpose any objection, but I do express the hope that the Senate conferees, if the matter goes to conference, will remember the great importance of the convention to the future of the country in international radio affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The amendment of the Committee on Appropriations was, on page 1, line 3, after the words "sum of," to strike out "\$35,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$20,000," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Resolved, etc., That the sum of \$20,000 is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to remain available until June 30, 1930, to defray the expenses of participation by the United States in the meeting of the International Technical Consulting Committee on Radio Communications, to be held at The Hague in September, 1929, including travel and subsistence or per diem in lieu of subsistence (notwithstanding the provisions of any other act), compensation of employees, stenographic and other services by contract if deemed necessary, rent of office, purchase of necessary books and documents, printing and binding, official cards, and such other expenses as may be authorized by the Secretary of State.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED

Bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

A bill (S. 1536) for the relief of Blanch Broomfield; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON:

A bill (S. 1537) to amend subdivision (a) of section 1 of the act entitled "An act making it a felony with penalty for certain aliens to enter the United States of America under certain conditions in violation of law," approved March 4, 1929; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. BROOKHART:

A bill (S. 1538) to amend the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended; to the Committee on Finance.

A bill (S. 1539) to amend the Federal reserve act and the national banking laws, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 1540) to amend section 5197 of the Revised Statutes, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SHORTRIDGE:

A bill (S. 1541) granting a pension to Sarah McCraney; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1542) for the relief of Austin G. Tainter; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A bill (S. 1543) for the relief of Joseph H. Greer; and
A bill (S. 1544) to amend section 305 of the World War veterans' act, 1924, as amended, relating to lapsed, canceled, or reduced insurance; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. DENEEN:

A bill (S. 1545) granting a pension to Mabel Jane Maher Boosey; to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (S. 1546) for the relief of Clara Thurnes; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 1547) authorizing the appointment and retirement as a captain, United States Army, of A. J. Schliesser; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

A bill (S. 1549) relating to personal injury suits by seamen; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. NORBECK:

A bill (S. 1550) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 1551) to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to acquire a herd of musk oxen for introduction into Alaska for experimentation with a view to their domestication and utilization in the Territory; and

A bill (S. 1552) to amend the definition of oleomargarine contained in the act entitled "An act defining butter; also imposing

a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

A bill (S. 1553) granting an increase of pension to Emillicent Van Horn (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ALLEN:

A bill (S. 1554) granting an increase of pension to Deborah E. McCune (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 1555) granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Robinson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BRATTON:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 62) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing for the exclusion of aliens in the apportionment of Representatives among the several States; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. DILL:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 63) authorizing the Cascade Tunnel Association to enter upon and have reserved and conveyed land belonging to the United States within the forest reserve in the easterly limits of King County and the westerly limits of Chelan County, Wash., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

• Mr. PINE. Mr. President, I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask may be read, and I ask then unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 61) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to begin October 5, 1929, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed International Petroleum Exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Okla., beginning October 5, 1929, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exposition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling and necessary exposure, the duty, if paid, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use, and the penalties prescribed by law shall be enforced against any person guilty of any illegal sale, use, or withdrawal.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I would like to ask the Senator from Oklahoma a question. Is the resolution initiated by the oil producers who recently sought the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States under which they might form combinations in restraint of trade and foster the monopoly which largely exists among the large oil producers of the United States?

Mr. PINE. Mr. President, I hardly understand the Senator's question.

Mr. KING. Perhaps it was my fault. What I am trying to ascertain is whether or not the movement is sponsored by the Oil Trust of the United States, the six or seven Standard Oil corporations and a few others which control the Petroleum Institute, or by some persons who have been trying to get from the Attorney General permission, which, fortunately, he has denied, to form combinations in restraint of trade and more firmly to rivet the oil monopoly upon the people of the United States?

Mr. PINE. The exposition is sponsored by the people of Tulsa and the State of Oklahoma. Of course, those who are interested in the monopoly do participate in the exposition, but it has nothing to do with the monopoly of the industry whatsoever.

Mr. KING. Is it the thought, when the convention shall be held, if one shall be held at Tulsa, that there shall be an effort

made to secure an international cartel which will control the price of oil?

Mr. PINE. It is not the desire of those who are behind the exposition to accomplish that end. The exposition is an annual exposition held at Tulsa, and Congress passed a similar joint resolution last year.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I understand this is a joint resolution. It is the custom of the Senate that such joint resolutions shall go to a committee. I feel that for that reason alone I shall have to object to its present consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is made. The joint resolution will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

CONSTRUCTION OF BRIDGES

Mr. TYDINGS introduced a bill (S. 1535) to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, which was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I introduce a bill to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge at Newport, Ark. A misunderstanding occurred between the highway commission of the State and the War Department with reference to it which makes the bill necessary. I ask that the bill may be referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The bill (S. 1548) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Newport, Ark., was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

Mr. SHEPPARD subsequently said: Mr. President, from the Committee on Commerce I ask leave to report back two bridge bills. They are unanimously reported by the committee, and I ask unanimous consent for their consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received at this time.

Mr. SHEPPARD, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1535) to extend the time for the construction of the bridge across the Chesapeake Bay, reported it without amendment; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge authorized by act of Congress, approved February 15, 1927, to be built by the Chesapeake Bay Bridge Co., a corporation, across the Chesapeake Bay, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHEPPARD also, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 1548) extending the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Newport, Ark., reported it without amendment, and, there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration, and it was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the White River at or near Newport, Ark., authorized to be built by the State Highway Commission of Arkansas by the act of Congress approved May 29, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

SEC. 2. The right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARTHA E. DAUGHERTY

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1456) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Daugherty, which was referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed.

SALARY ADJUSTMENT FOR CONGRESSIONAL OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES

Mr. BLEASE and Mr. ODDIE each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the bill (S. 1531) to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENTS TO THE TARIFF BILL

Mr. NORRIS, Mr. FLETCHER, and Mr. PINE each submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to House bill 2667, the tariff revision bill, which were severally referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

Mr. BRATTON submitted two amendments intended to be proposed by him to House bill 2667, the tariff revision bill, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

PROGRESS OF PEACE—ADDRESS BY HON. CHARLES E. HUGHES

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I have in my hand an important address delivered by Mr. Charles E. Hughes entitled "The Year's Major Factors in the Progress of Peace." I desire to have this address printed as a Senate document, and I ask that it may be referred to the Committee on Printing with a view to obtaining the necessary consent and an estimate of the expenses of printing.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it will be so ordered.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 3671) to authorize and direct a survey to be made of the Escambia River and its tributaries, Alabama and Florida, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

EXTENDING THE TIMES FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN BRIDGES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1453) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of certain bridges, and for other purposes, which was, on page 4, after line 15, to insert the following:

(j) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of the bridge across the Tombigbee River at or near Aberdeen, in Monroe County, Miss., authorized to be built by the board of supervisors of Monroe County by the act of Congress approved February 8, 1928, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

(k) That the States of Illinois and Indiana be, and are hereby, authorized to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge and approaches thereto across the Wabash River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, at or near Vincennes, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

There is hereby conferred upon the States of Illinois and Indiana all such rights and powers to enter upon lands and to acquire, condemn, occupy, possess, and use real estate and other property needed for the location, construction, operation, and maintenance of such bridge and its approaches as are possessed by railroad corporations for railroad purposes or by bridge corporations for bridge purposes in the States in which such real estate or other property is situated, upon making just compensation therefor, to be ascertained and paid according to the laws of such States, and the proceedings therefor shall be the same as in the condemnation or expropriation of property for public purposes in such States.

(l) That the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across Tampa Bay from Pinellas Point to Piney Point, Fla., authorized to be built by the act of Congress approved April 5, 1928, by Herman Simmonds, jr., his heirs, legal representatives, and assigns, are hereby extended one and three years, respectively, from the date of approval hereof.

(m) That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the projected Gallatin-Martha Road, between Sumner and Wilson Counties, in the State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund authorized by the law of the State of Tennessee which provides for the construction of the bridge to be built under this act, which shall be sufficient to amortize the bonds issued under the laws of Tennessee as soon as possible under reasonable charges but within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same,

and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

(n) That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, on the projected Charlotte-Ashland City Road, in Cheatham County, in the State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management and to provide a sinking fund, authorized by the law of the State of Tennessee which provides for the construction of the bridge to be built under this act, which shall be sufficient to amortize the bonds issued under such act as soon as possible under reasonable charges but within a period of not to exceed 25 years, from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

(o) That the consent of Congress is hereby granted to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Cumberland River, at a point suitable to the interests of navigation, between Gainesboro and Granville in the county of Jackson, in the State of Tennessee, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906, and subject to the conditions and limitations contained in this act.

If tolls are charged for the use of such bridge, the rates of toll shall be so adjusted as to provide a fund sufficient to pay the reasonable cost of maintaining, repairing, and operating the bridge and its approaches under economical management, and to provide a sinking fund authorized by the law of the State of Tennessee which provides for the construction of the bridge to be built under this act, which shall be sufficient to amortize the bonds issued under the law of Tennessee, as soon as possible under reasonable charges, but within a period of not to exceed 25 years from the completion thereof. After a sinking fund sufficient for such amortization shall have been so provided, such bridge shall thereafter be maintained and operated free of tolls, or the rates of toll shall thereafter be so adjusted as to provide a fund of not to exceed the amount necessary for the proper maintenance, repair, and operation of the bridge and its approaches under economical management. An accurate record of the costs of the bridge and its approaches, the expenditures for maintaining, repairing, and operating the same, and of the daily tolls collected, shall be kept and shall be available for the information of all persons interested.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair calls the attention of the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the bill.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Washington that there is an amendment in reference to two bridges in Tennessee. I yield to the Senator from Washington to make a motion in regard to the bill, if he desires to do so.

Mr. JONES. I was going to move that the Senate concur in the House amendment; and I so move, Mr. President.

The motion was agreed to.

RADIO ADDRESSES OF SENATOR ALLEN AND SENATOR PITTMAN

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, the Washington Star of Sunday, the 16th instant, contains a very interesting report of the speeches of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN] and the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] on proceedings and enactments of the present session of the Congress. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PITTMAN AND ALLEN DEBATE FARM PLAN—KANSAN LAUDS PROGRAM OF ADMINISTRATION—NEVADAN ASSAILS IT

The farm-relief program of the Hoover administration, a program with the much-discussed debentures no part of it, was lauded and denounced in turn last evening in radio addresses by two Members of the Senate who figured prominently in the long legislative battle.

The bill which President Hoover signed yesterday with evident satisfaction was described as "a happy solution of a perplexing problem," by Senator HENRY J. ALLEN, Republican, of Kansas.

The opposite view was advanced by Senator KEY PITTMAN, Nevada Democrat, who asserted that in passing the bill "the Republican administration has violated its pledges to the farmers of the country."

DISCUSS HISTORY OF MEASURE

The two Senators discussed the history of the passage of the bill and gave their views on what may be expected to develop from its provisions, in addresses broadcast over a coast-to-coast network of stations as features of the National Radio Forum, arranged by the Star and sponsored by the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Senator ALLEN, who succeeded to the seat held formerly by Vice President Curtis, did not stop with an expression of gratification over the passage of the farm bill. He predicted that the tariff bill passed by the Senate—"if one is passed"—will be "a very different bill from the one coming from the House."

SEES BORAH RESOLUTION O. K.

Asserting that President Hoover called Congress into extraordinary session to accomplish tariff revision with special reference to agricultural products, he described the House tariff bill as one that would set up "an astonishing revision of schedules." Senator ALLEN expressed the opinion that the Senate this week will pass the Borah resolution under which the Senate Finance Committee, which has the tariff bill in charge, would be instructed to limit revision to agricultural schedules.

"Passage of that resolution will be grim notice on the House that the Senate intends to follow out the Republican Party's pledges in the presidential campaign," he declared.

Commenting on the farm bill, Senator ALLEN said it was not surprising that the debenture clause finally was stricken out. Nobody doubted its ultimate defeat, he said, for the reason that Members of Congress opposing the President's announced views would not take the responsibility of going to the country with a refusal to concur in an effort to solve the farm problem. He remarked that once the Senate forced the House to go on record with an expression on the debenture plan, that body voted against it "with surprising alacrity."

"It is astonishing," he said, referring to Members of the Senate as well as the House, "that men will denounce a measure up to the very moment of the vote and then vote for it. I realize," he added, "that the statement casts reflection on a man who gets himself in a parliamentary box."

PITTMAN'S EXPLANATION

Senator PITTMAN's explanation of the final vote in the Senate, which disclosed only eight of all who had fought for the debenture plan voting for the bill without it, was as follows:

"In the face of the active and bitter opposition of the President to the debenture plan, and in view of the conduct of the House of Representatives, further effort upon the part of the friends of the farmers seemed hopeless and futile, so some of these Senators surrendered, for the present, their convictions and voted to pass the administration bill in the hope that experience will convince the administration of their error where pledges, reason, and logic have failed."

Senator PITTMAN contended that adequate discussion of the debenture plan was had before the Senate Agricultural Committee incorporated it in its bill. The discussion, he said, incorporated testimony before a subcommittee of Agricultural Department experts to whom the President had referred the subject. He cited Senator BORAH's advocacy of the debenture plan, describing BORAH as one of the responsible spokesmen for Mr. Hoover during the presidential campaign.

ALLEN HELD IT "STRANGER"

Senator ALLEN's view was that injection of the debenture plan by the Senate was "surprising." Agreeing that the plan had been discussed in an earlier period, he held that the public was "an entire stranger to debenture." In view of pledges made during the campaign, he asserted, the people were bound to hold that Congress would follow the President more closely perhaps than at other times because of the primary emergency of the agricultural situation.

Senator PITTMAN prepared his address in advance of delivery, but Senator ALLEN spoke extemporaneously, not having had an opportunity to put his views in writing for the broadcast.

Senator PITTMAN spoke as follows:

"Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, through the kind invitation of the Star National Radio Forum, I have the honor and privilege to address you with regard to the reasons for and the accomplishments of the present special session of Congress.

"Let us first ascertain the reasons which impelled the President to call the special and extraordinary session of Congress. In the first sentence of his message to Congress he said:

"I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff."

"The pledges referred to in the President's message were those made by him and by his authorized spokesmen during the last campaign, and the promises contained in the Republican platform that 'the Republican Party pledges itself to the development and enactment of measures which shall place the agricultural interests of America on a basis of economic equality with the industries to insure its prosperity and success.'

"The limited changes in the tariff evidently referred to changes that would tend to reduce the price of things the farmer must buy and increase the price of the products that he sells. That tariff revision alone could not fully accomplish such purpose was confessed by the adoption of the program in the Republican platform for farm relief and in the speeches delivered by the Republican candidate to the voters of the country.

PROGRESS IS REVIEWED

"The necessity for a general revision of the tariff schedules or the raising of the tariff rates upon the products of manufacturing industries was not intimated in the Republican platform.

"What has been accomplished so far by the special session of Congress in the redemption of such pledges? Upon the convening of Congress substantially identical administration farm relief bills were introduced in the Senate and in the House of Representatives and referred to the Committee on Agriculture in each body. The Senate committee immediately proceeded with the consideration and study of the proposed legislation. Twelve hearings were held and 66 witnesses were heard. The so-called optional debenture plan was proposed in committee as an addition to the bill by way of amendment, so that it might be utilized by the President's farm board at their option, in the event that the permanent plan established in the bill should prove ineffective as to some particular crop. Such debenture plan was fully discussed and considered at such hearings. The committee favored the adoption of such debenture amendment. Before action was taken, however, a subcommittee, appointed by the committee, called upon the President to ascertain his views with regard to such debenture amendment. The subcommittee was advised by the President—so it was asserted in the Senate—that he had substantially at that particular moment no opinion upon the subject, but referred the subcommittee and the Committee on Agriculture to the experts of the Agriculture Department.

"Thereafter the Committee on Agriculture called before it the experts of the Agriculture Department and listened to their testimony. The hearings being closed, the committee voted unanimously to adopt the debenture amendment to the bill, and then, by unanimous vote, reported favorably to the Senate the bill, including the debenture amendment.

SENATE ADOPTED DEBENTURE

"The Senate by an aye and no vote adopted the debenture amendment to the bill, and then by an aye and no vote passed the bill as so amended. The chairman of the committee, on the floor of the Senate, after the adoption of the debenture amendment and the passage of the bill by the Senate, stated that he and three other members of the committee, in executive meeting of the committee, had reserved the right to change their minds and to vote in the Senate against the debenture amendment if they so desired. The committee is composed of 18 members.

"The bill, as amended, was then placed in conference between the two Houses to see if an agreement could be reached. The representatives of both bodies on the conference agreed upon the elimination of the debenture amendment and upon the House bill substantially as it was introduced.

"The Senate, on the 11th day of June, by an aye and no vote, refused to concur in such conference report and refused to pass the bill without the debenture amendment.

"The House of Representatives on June 13, by an aye and no vote of 250 to 113, declared that they would not agree that the debenture plan should be included in the bill as an amendment. This overwhelming vote was to be expected.

"The States whose chief industry is agriculture have a small representation in the House. A large element in that body coming from the manufacturing centers are opposed to any farm relief, while a still larger element is subservient to the party whip.

"The Senate finally on Friday, the 14th of June, passed the administration's farm marketing bill without the debenture plan amendment and substantially in the original form in which the bill was introduced in the House.

"In the face of the active and bitter opposition of the President to the debenture plan, and in view of the conduct of the House of Representatives, further effort upon the part of the friends of the farmers seemed hopeless and futile, so some of these Senators surrendered, for the present, their convictions and voted to pass the administration bill in the hope that experience will convince the administration of their error where pledges, reason, and logic have failed.

BORAH IS QUOTED

"And what is the bill and what has been accomplished by its passage? Does it constitute a redemption of the pledges made by and on behalf of the Republican Party? Let us consult the opinion of Senator BORAH for an answer to these questions. No one can question that he is a friend of the farmer and that he was the most effective supporter of the President during the last campaign. He took part in the drafting of the farm plank in the Republican platform. He understood and he explained its meaning to the farmers of the country, and won their confidence and their support for the Republican ticket. In his speech in the Senate on June 10, he said, 'We think we will be able to show that

the debenture is one of the indispensable steps to placing the farmer upon an economic equality with the other industries so long as other industries are enjoying the protection which we give them through the tariff.' And farther on he declared, 'I repeat, as I said in the beginning, the real contest in this fight is whether the farmer is to be brought within the purview of the protective-tariff system. If he is denied a debenture, if he is denied adequate duties, then he is outside the system, its victim, and not its beneficiary.' In reply to Senator ALLEN, he said, 'I do not agree with the Senator upon that matter. I maintain that if the debenture plan is essential to placing the farmer upon an economic equality with other industries which enjoy the protective tariff, then our failure to do it would be a profound violation of the pledge we made.' In those words he reasserted the position that was maintained by all of the advocates of the debenture amendment.

"Senator JOHNSON, in his speech in the Senate on June 11, in opposition to the administration bill in the form that it afterwards passed the Senate, said: 'You may take it that in the days gone by when the Jardine bill was presented to the Committee on Agriculture—and it is the bill that is presented to us to-day, minus the debenture provision—that bill was repudiated by the Committees on Agriculture of both Houses of the Congress, by the Republican Party, and by the entire Congress.' Thus spoke Senator JOHNSON, who ran with Roosevelt.

HOUSE PASSES NEW BILL

"Not an advocate of such bill denied such charge. Similar assertions have been made on the floor of the Senate and no denial was ever recorded.

"The House of Representatives has passed an entirely new tariff bill, revising upward hundreds of schedules. What do the Republican Senators, who voted for the debenture and who are the proven friends of the farmers, have to say with regard to this tariff act? I again quote from Senator BORAH's speech. A colloquy took place between the Senator and Senator EDGE. Senator EDGE asserted that the new tariff act to a very decided extent increased the tariff upon practically all agricultural products. Senator BORAH replied: 'Does the Senator contend that the tariff bill just passed by the House would afford protection to American agriculture?' To which Senator EDGE responded: 'The representatives of the agricultural States, Members of the Senate in 1922, practically wrote the schedule for agriculture that appeared in that bill.' To this last statement Senator BORAH replied: 'I do not know anything about that; but if the representatives of agriculture wrote the bill which just passed the House, my conception of protection of American agriculture and theirs is widely different.' Continuing, Mr. BORAH said: 'Mr. President, it is not enough that they put duties upon the agricultural products; the important point is the protection which they give to agriculture compared with the protection which they give industries. * * * He (the farmer) is not willing, in order to get those protective duties, to have embargoes placed upon manufactured products.' Thus spoke BORAH, the avowed advocate of the protective-tariff policy.

"It is clear, in the opinion of the advocates of the debenture plan in both parties, that nothing beneficial has been accomplished so far during the special session, and that the Republican administration has violated its pledges to the farmers of the country, in which opinion I respectfully concur."

FARM RELIEF AND THE TARIFF

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I ask permission to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of last Saturday entitled "The Devil Drives," in which farm relief and the debenture are discussed, and an editorial from to-day's Baltimore Sun entitled "Tariff Warnings," dealing with the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DEVIL DRIVES

The farm-relief measure that is to become law is not a redemption of the pledge made by the Republican Party in Kansas City to equalize agriculture with industry. It offers no prospect, at the best, of more than stabilization of prices, which is not at all the same thing as equalization of agricultural prices with those of industry. At the same time the measure makes hash of the Republican preachments on keeping the Government out of business, dinned into the public's ears with merciless monotony these past nine years, for never in time of peace has a bureaucracy so gigantic been raised by the Government to guide and regulate the business affairs of millions of individual citizens.

To tell the plain, bald truth the President and his party do not know how to produce an equalizer between agriculture and industry. Industry has been favored for generations with effectual tariff protection, which permits the manufacturers to lift the prices paid by farmers as well as by the urban communities which share the profits of protection. Mr. Hoover dare not take the tariff off industry, as some of the more radical western members of his party have suggested. Nor can he make tariff protection for the farmers effectual with respect to the great basic crops. It is obvious that tariff duties are meaningless on crops of

which we produce a surplus that must be exported. That has been explained too often by economists and has been admitted too often by eminent Republicans to call for discussion.

Republicans like Dawes and Lowden have said this situation must be met by the Government's putting agriculture on stilts and then assessing the net costs against the farmer—through the equalization fee—so that he would not overproduce and multiply his existing troubles. But Mr. Hoover, like Mr. Coolidge, has held that the system of assessing benefits against the farmer, through the equalization fee, is not workable, and they made out a powerful case. Republicans like BORAH have said that a direct Government bounty on agricultural exports, called a debenture, is on all fours logically with the protective tariff for industry, and they have proved that. But Mr. Hoover holds that, whatever the analogy in principle, in practice the debenture would be disastrous, and he has substantially proved that.

Yet, needs must when the devil drives. There is the fact that after all these years of "the American system" of which Mr. Hoover boasts, the farmer is on the down end of the economic seesaw. There is also the fact that Mr. Hoover and his spokesmen, Senators BORAH and BROOKHART conspicuous among them, led the farmers to believe he would remedy their ills. Moreover, Mr. Hoover talked very largely in his campaign about the insignificance of "several hundred millions" taken from the Public Treasury of so rich a Nation as this for the benefit of the farmers. And therefore we have ahead of us a law under which the Government, with a fund of half a billion from the Treasury to draw on, will begin to see what it can do by stepping into the farmer's affairs here and there while it evades direct responsibility wherever possible.

This half billion fund is an enormous lot of money, and may be used to regulate virtually every stage of the movement of crops from the time they appear above the ground to the time they appear upon the consumer's table. And under the bill the Government is prepared to sustain absolute losses as a result of interposition. Yet the administration insists that the Government is not doing this. Stabilization corporations, owned by the farmers, are to do it with the Government's money, if the Government is convinced that it should grant specific sums desired. And the objective of the Government, as revealed in inner discussions among those in touch with its authorities and experts, is to stabilize the price of certain crops—that is, to check, if possible, violent fluctuation in the price of a crop in a given period—which certainly is not identical with equalization of agricultural prices with those of industry, although it involves interference with private trade.

Clearly, then, there is to be no bold undertaking to redeem the Kansas City pledge to equalize, and yet there is to be set up a bureaucracy so immense and so powerful that, however it may be camouflaged as a farm board working through stabilization corporations and other farmers' agencies, surpasses anything the country has known in peace times. Mr. Hoover is to try to do something, though he is not certain what he can do or how far he should go, and he is to work through a vast bureaucracy, though he professes to hate bureaucratic interference with business and wishes to call this by another name. All of this should be recognized. That done, everyone will hope that in cautious experimentation with his new machinery he will ultimately produce real and not illusory benefits for the distressed farmers, even though they may be less than promised, and that he will not find his new bureaucracy a Frankenstein monster.

TARIFF WARNINGS

The possible consequences of unrestrained and indiscriminate tariff boosting such as is provided by the bill passed by the House have been plain to informed people ever since the agitation started. Dramatic substantiation of these unheeded warnings, however, is given in the report in to-day's Sun by Mr. J. A. Stevenson, from Ottawa, citing the already bitter feeling in Canadian farming circles against American tariff policy. The victory of an unprecedented number of Conservatives in the provincial election in Saskatchewan, which is ordinarily as Liberal as Mississippi is Democratic, is attributed by Mr. Stevenson to rural resentment at the American duties on cattle and to a desire to put into power the political party already committed to tariff reprisals. Mr. Stevenson's prediction is that not even a promise by Premier Mackenzie King to support such a tariff will avail to save his party, for the simple reason that when reprisals are desired the people will prefer the political party which is wholeheartedly for reprisals, i. e., the Conservative Party.

Add Canada to France and Argentina as the most articulate objectors to our irresponsible tariff plans, and we have a picture of what the future holds in store. The attempt of Senator BORAH and Senator ALLEN to hold tariff revision down to the agricultural schedules, as Mr. Hoover originally suggested Congress should do, will not, of course, improve the feeling in western Canada described by Mr. Stevenson, but it represents a worthy effort to reduce friction generally and to prevent the development of other even more dangerous unpleasantness in other quarters. Senator JIM WATSON, the Republican leader in the Senate, insists that the President favors industrial tariff increases along with those on farm products. Messrs. BORAH and ALLEN insist that Mr. Hoover is for a farmer's revision only. Although it is possible to quote

Mr. Hoover, like Scripture, for a variety of purposes, it is reasonable to believe that his message, in which he asked for restraint in the revision of the tariff, suggests his real opinion.

Although it seems very likely that the general revisionists will succeed in the Senate as they did in the House, the Borah resolution provides the occasion for a fight well worth making. Because of the freedom of debate in the Senate, frank criticism and honest discussion is certain to be directed against the tariff bill, criticism and discussion which the "efficient" machinery of the House made impossible. There is in the Senate a chance to mobilize the sentiment for a decent tariff bill as opposed to the preposterous rationalized horse trading which came from the House. Before the debate is over the country will at least have heard of such situations in the world as that in the western Provinces of Canada. There are many straws to show the way the wind is blowing, and in the Senate it will be impossible to confine the discussion to the plaintive recitals of lobbyists for alleged infant industries and undisputed campaign contributors.

RHODE ISLAND SOLDIERS AND SAILORS WHO DIED ON THE WESTERN FRONT DURING THE WORLD WAR

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, Rhode Island is very proud of her record in the World War. Her sons responded nobly to the call for soldiers. Many of them who went to France have never returned, and they rest in the cemeteries on the field of battle. I would like to send to the desk a list of these veterans who are buried in foreign cemeteries and ask that it be printed in the RECORD as a tribute to these men.

There being no objection, the list was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Names of Rhode Island soldiers and sailors who died on the western front during the World War and location of their graves

Name	Rank and organization	Grave	Row	Block
FLANDERS FIELD CEMETERY				
Daglis, Tony	Pvt., Co. F, 148 Inf.	13	3	A
AINNE-MARNE AMERICAN CEMETERY, NO. 1764, BELLEAU, AINNE, FRANCE				
Johnson, Robert T.	Pvt., Hq. Co., 2d Div., 9 Inf.	36	3	A
Salvas, Arthur	Pvt., Co. H, 2d Div., 9 Inf.	1	5	B
Stewart, William D. F.	Pvt., Co. F, 2d Div., 23 Inf.	59	8	B
Northup, Gerald K.	Pvt., Co. D, 2d Div., 23 Inf.; 3d Div., 8 M. G. Bn.	9	8	A
Feltham, John H., Jr.	2d Lt., Co. K, 26th Div., 103 Inf.	56	1	A
Blake, Raymond E.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. A, 26th Div., 103 M. G. Bn.	64	2	A
Coates, Howard C.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. A, 26th Div.	47	1	A
Martina, Reno	do.	64	11	A
Osmolski, Boleslaw	Pvt. 1 cl., 26th Div., 103 F. A.	80	9	A
LaFerriere, Arthur	Pvt., 2d Corps Art. Park Nondivisional Aviation instruction center.	78	2	B
ST. MIHIEL CEMETERY, NO. 1233				
Bartlett, Gordon	Corp., Bty. D, 2d Div., 17 F. A.	21	28	D
Bourdeau, Joseph J.	Pvt., Co. I, 4th Div., 39 Inf.	17	9	D
Akers, Quincy J.	Pvt., 28th Fld. Hosp., 4th Div., 4 Sanitary Train.	20	19	A
Boisse, Eugene	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. H, 5th Div., 60 Inf.	15	7	C
Waters, Thomas J., Jr.	Pvt., Co. F, 61st Inf., 5th Div.	19	28	D
Coats, Archibald	2d Lt., Bat. D, 5th Div., 19 F. A.	13	1	A
Magner, James F.	Pvt. 1 cl., Hq. Co., 7th Div., 80 F. A.	30	25	C
Wolpert, Louis	Pvt., Co. A, 26th Div., 103 Inf.	5	3	C
Benson, John E.	Pvt. 1 cl., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	36	2	B
Broadhead, Joshua K.	Sgt., Co. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	26	5	B
Butts, Alfred C.	Pvt., Bty. B, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	33	27	A
Cassidy, John T.	Wag., Sup. Co., 26th Div., 103 F. A.	32	10	C
Dugal, Dona J.	Mech., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	18	25	B
Greene, Carl F.	Pvt., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	31	10	C
Harmon, Frederick A., Jr.	Pvt. 1 cl., Bty. B, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	4	1	A
Lorenson, Victor J.	Pvt., Hq. Co., 26th Div., 103 F. A.	1	18	B
Payette, Albert J.	Pvt., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	6	23	A
Rico, George A.	Pvt., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	33	11	B
Williams, Gaskin P.	Pvt., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	24	14	D
Leland, Earl C.	Pvt., Hq. Co., 19th Div., 114 F. A.	19	23	C
Pieracini, Louis Leo.	Cook, Co. F, 76th Div., 301 Engr.	10	15	C
Wall, James E.	Pvt., Co. M, 77th Div., 307 Inf.	10	20	B
Aucoin, George T.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. M, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	8	8	A
Collins, Daniel L.	Pvt., Co. A, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	7	5	A
Di Raimo, John	Pvt., Co. H, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	32	23	D
Fay, Philip J.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. A, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	19	29	B
Coffe, Albert P.	Pvt., Co. A, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	8	25	A
Kammerer, Otto	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. F, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	26	22	D
Megdrichian, Enovk	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. E, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	14	21	D
Ross, George	Pvt., Co. B, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	12	8	A
Smith, George H.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. H, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	30	4	D
Streimer, James R.	Pvt., Co. B, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	20	4	B
Thornton, Adam	Pvt., Co. K, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	27	28	D
Torti, Nicola	Pvt., Co. K, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	34	23	D
Kelley, Thomas F.	Pvt., Co. C, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	3	29	C
Johnson, Charles F.	Pvt., Co. F, 82d Div., 325 Inf.	21	3	B
Riendeau, Napoleon P.	Pvt., Co. H, 82d Div., 325 Inf.	2	16	B

Names of Rhode Island soldiers and sailors who died on the western front during the World War and location of their graves—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	Grave	Row	Block
ST. MIHIEL CEMETERY, NO. 1233—CON.				
Hubbard, John L.	1st Lt., Hq. Det., 3 A. I. C., Air Service Aviation Instruction centers.	19	27	A
Rose, Manuel	Pvt., 47th Co., Army Service Corps, Nondivisional.	1	25	C
Morris, Manuel F.	Sgt., Bty. E, 73d C. A. C., Coast Art. Corps.	32	14	A
Walker, Grover C.	Pvt., Bty. E, 54th Coast Art. Corps.	8	14	A
Graham, Robert A.	Pvt. 1 cl., Ord. Cps. Att. Hq. 2d Army Ordnance Nondivisional.	21	12	D
SOMME CEMETERY NO. 636				
Conover, Richard S.	Cpl., Co. D, 1st Div., 18 Inf.	14	14	C
Hadfield, Joseph E.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. C, 2d Fld. Sig. Bn., 1st Div. 1 Engineers.	16	9	A
OISE-AISNE CEMETERY NO. 608				
Bradbrook, William	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. K, 1st Div., 26 Inf.	30	3	D
Greene, James A.	Cpl., Co. F.	31	28	B
Redford, David A.	1st Lt., 75th Co., 2d Div., 6 Reg. U. S. Marines.	7	17	A
Klimaski, Toni	Pvt., Co. L, 3rd Div., 30 Inf.	35	14	B
Wright, Daniel B., Jr.	Sgt., Co. K, 3rd Div., 38 Inf.	2	20	A
Richardson, John H.	Cook, Co. A, 26th Div., 103d M. G. Bn.	26	19	D
Lake, Beverley S.	Chief Mech., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	37	38	D
St. Amour, Eugene K.	Pvt., Bty. A, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	32	37	D
Coutu, Joseph R.	Pvt., Co. G, 32d Div., 125 Inf.	3	29	C
Crowley, Daniel	Pvt. 1 cl., Hq. Co., 78th Div., 310 Inf.	6	22	A
Languiran, Napoleon	Cpl., 168 Cas. Co., Nondivisional.	35	14	C
Shields, William, Jr.	Cpl., Co. K, 49 Inf. Nondivisional.	15	26	B
Schramm, Leo	B. M. 2 cl., U. S. N. R. F., Nondivisional.	15	10	C
Lacey, William F.	Pvt., Field Hosp. 44, Miscel. Hosp. Nondivisional.	17	30	A
SURESNES AMERICAN CEMETERY				
Bertheman, Ray C.	Cpl., Bty. B, 26th Div., 103 Field Art.	18	4	A
Jacob, John	Cook, Co. G, 26th Div., 326 Inf.	32	5	A
Buffum, Arthur D.	Pvt., Bty. D, 66 Coast Art. Corps.	19	8	A
Veins, Henry A.	Pvt. 1 cl., 7th Co., 3d Mtr. Mech. Air Ser.	19	13	B
Crocker, Walozo, Warren	Seaman, U. S. Naval Reserve Force.	39	6	A
MEUSE-ARGONNE AMERICAN CEMETERY				
James, Rainey	Pvt., Co. F, 2d Div., 9 Inf.	40	18	E
Scott, Robert P.	Cpl., Co. E, 2d Div., 9 Inf.	39	25	B
Darnbrough, Albert	Cpl., Co. B, 2d Div., 23 Inf.	20	30	E
Lavoie, Ulysses H.	Cpl., Co. L, 4th Div., 39 Inf.	23	25	D
Murray, Henry	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. G, 4th Div., 39 Inf.	1	9	C
Hanlin, William F.	1st Lt., Co. B, 4th Div., 47 Inf.	23	12	A
Blackman, Edward S.	Cpl., Co. G.	4	39	H
Chouinard, Theodore	Pvt., 1 cl., Co. E, 5th Div., 61 Inf.	10	27	E
Harnois, Joseph	Pvt., Co. B, 5th Div., 61 Inf.	16	30	H
Langevin, Henry J.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. K, 5th Div., 61 Inf.	38	10	H
Perrelle, Antoine	Pvt., Co. D, 5th Div., 61 Inf.	29	44	C
Price, Harold E.	Pvt., Co. K, 5th Div., 61 Inf.	36	8	A
Dodge, Rowland S.	2d Lt., 26th Div., 101 Inf.	21	23	E
Smeaton, William	Pvt., Co. E, 26th Div., 101 Inf.	37	29	H
Jentzel, Harold H.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. C, 26th Div., 103 M. G. Bn.	40	19	H
Rice, John G.	Pvt., Bty. B, 26th Div., 101 F. A.	3	5	E
Bourne, Russell K.	Cpl., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	5	26	F
Dennis, Richard J.	Sgt., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	33	40	G
Eicke, Wilmer H.	Pvt. 1 cl., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	20	4	D
Hemphill, James	Pvt., Bty. C, 26th Div., 103 F. A.	13	34	C
Peterson, Arthur R.	Pvt. 1 cl., 104 Amb. Co., 26th Div., 101 Sanitary Train.	40	46	A
Leary, Charles W.	Pvt., Co. L, 28th Div., 109 Inf.	2	28	B
Byrne, Charles H.	Pvt., Co. H, 29th Div., 114 Inf.	36	24	E
McElheran, Alexander J.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. I, 29th Div., 114 Inf.	36	41	G
Phelan, Frank A.	Pvt., Co. L, 29th Div., 116 Inf.	7	9	F
Brazeau, Joseph	Cpl., Co. H, 32d Div., 125 Inf.	37	19	G
Hanrahan, Martin F.	Pvt., Co. M, 32d Div., 28 Inf.	17	16	H
Wheaton, Benjamin P.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. D, 28 Inf., 120 M. G. Bn.	8	10	B
Kiernan, Charles	Pvt., Bty. C, 35th Div., 128 F. A.	21	21	E
Healey, Edward, Jr.	Pvt., Co. K, 37th Div., 147 Inf.	11	41	C
La Forest, Eugene F.	Cook, Co. E, 76th Div., 301 Engrs.	2	42	D
Jolicoeur, William	Pvt., Co. A, 77th Div., 306 Inf.	18	20	D
Ward, Calbraith	Sgt., Co. M, 77th Div., 306 Inf.	39	17	B
Belhumeur, Donatien	Pvt., Co. A, 77th Div., 306 Inf.	38	23	A
Colella, Isidoro	Pvt., Co. B, 77th Div., 306 Inf.	23	29	H
Couture, Israel	Pvt., Co. I, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	28	15	C
D'Antuono, Luigi	Pvt., Co. M, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	9	40	G
Driscoll, Mert	Pvt., Co. D, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	1	17	B
Gauthier, Rene	Pvt., Co. M, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	13	16	G
Hampshire, Joseph W., Jr.	Pvt., Co. A, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	12	42	F
Hardy, Joseph A.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. G, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	8	46	D
O'Connell, James W.	Pvt., Co. M, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	5	23	B
Pucci, Andrea	Pvt., Co. B, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	36	10	B
Raymond, Walter J.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. B, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	9	30	C
La Riviere, Lucien	Bugler, Co. I, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	39	28	C

Names of Rhode Island soldiers and sailors who died on the western front during the World War and location of their graves—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	Grave	Row	Block
MEUSE-ARGONNE AMERICAN CEMETERY—contd.				
Lepper, William H., Jr.	Pvt., Co. D, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	20	11	C
Marini, Marino	Pvt., Co. E, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	3	25	F
Simmons, Albert J.	Pvt., Co. D, 78th Div., 310 Inf.	10	14	B
Flynn, Harold Francis	1st Lt., Co. L, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	18	37	B
Cottrell, Samuel M.	Pvt., Co. L, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	24	9	H
Cronan, Henry Joseph	Pvt., Co. L, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	6	33	A
Cutting, William H.	Pvt., Co. D, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	38	4	A
Dimarco, Donato	Pvt., Co. B, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	31	15	F
Dionne, Demetrios	Pvt., Co. G, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	12	37	E
Dionne, Joseph A.	Pvt., Co. G, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	34	26	F
Ducharme, Peter	Pvt., Co. K, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	19	34	A
Kelly, William A.	Pvt., Co. L, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	32	6	D
Lmanian, Alexander	Pvt., Co. L, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	6	37	E
Milewski, Antonio	Pvt., Co. I, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	23	5	B
Murphy, John Joseph	Pvt., Co. C, 79th Div., 314th Inf.	32	39	B
Pierce, William, Jr.	Pvt., Co. K, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	10	35	H
Reardon, William Lyman	Pvt., Co. K, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	3	7	F
Sweeney, James F.	Pvt., Co. K, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	10	20	A
Tabor, Clifford Esmond	Pvt., San. Det., 79th Div., 314 Inf.	24	13	D
Tortora, Domenico	Pvt., Co. B, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	12	5	C
Yelle, Alphonse	Pvt., Co. G, 79th Div., 314 Inf.	14	5	F
Blanchard, Eugene	Pvt., Co. G, 82d Div., 326 Inf.	5	27	G
Cecarini, Alcibiade	Pvt., Co. C, 82d Div., 326 Inf.	35	26	B
Miller, Arthur P.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. D, 82d Div., 326 Inf.	32	17	A
O'Neil, Joseph F.	Pvt., Co. M, 82d Div., 326 Inf.	22	28	A
Pisciotta, Salve	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. C, 82d Div., 326 Inf.	4	24	A
Burnes, John F.	Cpl., Co. G, 82d Div., 327 Inf.	32	6	A
Connolly, John J.	Pvt., Co. F, 82d Div., 327 Inf.	36	10	D
McKeown, John C.	Cpl., Co. K, 82d Div., 327 Inf.	2	16	G
Englehart, Charles	Pvt. 1 cl., 82d Div., 328 Inf.	21	21	H
Murphy, Michael G.	Pvt., Co. B, 82d Div., 319 M. G. Bn.	39	36	G
Walsh, William J.	Pvt., Co. F, 82d Div., 307 Amb. Tr.	16	18	A
Merrill, Harold W.	1st Lt., Aero Sqdn, Nondivisional	6	36	C
Fleming, Albert	Pvt., Bty. A, 1st Bn. Trench Art., Nondivisional	31	38	B
Broadfoot, Josiah F.	Cpl., Co. B, 326th Bn. Tank Corps, Nondivisional	18	17	H
Jencks, Andrew L.	Pvt., 313th Clothing Sqdn, Quartermaster Corps, Nondivisional	8	29	F

ENTERTAINMENTS AT THE WHITE HOUSE

Mr. BLEASE. I send to the desk a Senate resolution, which I ask may be read and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina offers a resolution, which will be read.

The Chief Clerk read the resolution (S. Res. 93).

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. EDGE. My point of order is made under Rule XI of the Standing Rules of the Senate, which reads:

OBJECTION TO READING A PAPER

When the reading of a paper is called for, and objected to, it shall be determined by a vote of the Senate, without debate.

I assume that the reading of the paper has been completed, of which I am very regretful; but under Rule XI I call for a vote of the Senate upon the reading of the paper.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will hold that it is too late to do so. What has been read is a resolution submitted by the Senator from South Carolina, and the matter it contains has already been read.

Mr. EDGE. In view of the fact that the paper has already been read, under the ruling of the Chair, I move that it be stricken from the RECORD of the Senate.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, the resolution is not before the Senate. I have introduced the resolution and have asked that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. There is not a word in the resolution which reflects on anybody. Mrs. Hoover did entertain a negro. Nobody denies that, I understand. Nobody denies that the people were there whom the newspapers have said were there. Personally I am not surprised. I said in the campaign last summer in three States in which I campaigned that if Mr. Hoover should be elected President of the United States negroes would be entertained and would eat in the White House. That has come to pass. This is simply to call attention to the fact that, in order to keep down a certain condition which might arise, the occupants of the White House should be careful as to whom they invite to come there hereafter. I do not care whether the Senate strikes

the resolution from the RECORD or not. I have got what I want out of it. I have had it read.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I do not think it is necessary to discuss or debate the contents of the matter which has been read. It is as near obscenity as it is possible for such a thing to be, in my judgment. Whether I am too late in the invocation of Rule XI or not, of course, the Vice President must decide.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. EDGE. I will yield in just a moment. It is for the Vice President to determine under Rule XI whether this issue shall be decided without debate. I have made the motion that the matter be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. I should like to call the Senator's attention to the fact that the words to which he objects are embodied in the resolution and are a part of it. Therefore, Mr. President, I move that the resolution be laid on the table.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I think that there is a different way to dispose of the resolution without undertaking to lay it on the table, which cuts off debate and consideration. I agree that the resolution should not have been read, but I am not in favor of the proceeding which has been suggested by the Senator from Connecticut. The resolution is here now, and the mere fact of laying it upon the table will not change the situation in the slightest.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have a motion pending.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state his point of order.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Under the rule, as I understand, the resolution goes over for one day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under the rule, the resolution will go to the Committee on the District of Columbia, if some other disposition is not made of it.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. EDGE. I should like to ask the Vice President whether my motion that the matter read be expunged from the RECORD is in order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it would be in order, but the Chair thinks if objection were made it could not now be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. BLEASE. I object.

Mr. EDGE. I ask unanimous consent that the matter be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. BLEASE. I object.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I inquire as to the nature of the motion offered by the Senator from New Jersey? I understood that it referred only to the document accompanying the resolution, and not to the resolution itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There is no document accompanying the resolution; the matter which was read is a part of the resolution. That is why the Chair made the decision he did. The resolution will be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I move that the resolution offered by the Senator from South Carolina be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and that all further reference to it be expunged from the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That can not be done unless the action by which the resolution was sent to the Committee on the District of Columbia be reconsidered. Is there objection to the reconsideration of that order?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. BINGHAM. Was there a vote on sending the resolution to the Committee on the District of Columbia?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It was so sent without objection. No objection was made, and it went to the committee as other resolutions go to committees when the request therefor is made.

Mr. KING. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield.

Mr. KING. I wish to ask a question of the Senator?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly; I yield.

Mr. KING. I did not quite comprehend the significance of the Senator's motion or his statement.

Mr. BINGHAM. The significance of it is this—

Mr. KING. Let me ask this question: Does the Senator mean that references heretofore made shall be expunged from the RECORD or that there shall be no further references?

Mr. BINGHAM. No. What I intended by my motion was this: In order to meet the situation where a resolution has been so worded as to give offense to hundreds of thousands of our fellow citizens and to give offense to the spirit of the Constitution and the Declaration of Independence, I intended to secure action whereby the resolution could be referred to the proper committee without having the wording of it printed in the RECORD, which is the case, as the Senator knows, as to at least 99 per cent of the resolutions which are referred to the committee without being printed in the RECORD.

Mr. KING. My question was induced by reason of the fact that the Senator used the word "further"—that no further reference be made to it in the RECORD.

Mr. BINGHAM. If I used that word, I ask that it be stricken out.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BINGHAM. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. It does seem to me that the Senate has control of its RECORD, and whether this is a resolution or whether it is not a resolution, the whole thing is now a part of the RECORD. I understand the motion of the Senator from New Jersey now, in substance repeated by the Senator from Connecticut, to be to expunge it from the RECORD.

Mr. EDGE. Exactly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I submit the parliamentary inquiry to the Vice President whether that motion is in order?

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, before the Chair makes a ruling—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The present occupant of the chair, without further consideration, believes that as the resolution has already gone to the committee the motion referred to by the Senator from Montana would not be in order; but a motion to expunge from the RECORD what would otherwise be printed in the RECORD would be in order.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That, as I understand, is now the motion of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Connecticut yield to me?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the object of my motion was that the reference of the resolution to the committee stand as stated by the Chair, but that the reading of the resolution by the clerk be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. EDGE and Mr. BLEASE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield first to the Senator from New Jersey, and then I will yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, it makes absolutely no difference to me in what way the parliamentary action is secured, but the motion I made was exactly as stated by the Senator from Connecticut, and I made it before the resolution was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. However, I am quite content to have it carried in the form in which it is now presented.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. BINGHAM. I will yield in a moment. My understanding of what the Senator from New Jersey said was that he wished to have the reading of the paper expunged. I do not think that the Senator from New Jersey, any more than myself, until I had examined it at the desk, realized that this indecent, obscene, doggerel verse was a part of the resolution, and therefore did not come under Rule XI, referred to by the Senator, because no one can object to the reading of a resolution.

Mr. EDGE. My first desire was to object to the reading of the resolution under Rule XI. Then, finding that the reading of the resolution had been completed, I made the motion that the matter be expunged from the RECORD. Upon a parliamentary inquiry being made by myself, the Vice President decided that it could not be done by a vote, but only by unanimous consent. Thereupon, I asked unanimous consent, which was refused.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina. The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BLEASE. Mr. President, my reason for asking that the resolution be referred to the committee was that it be not printed in the RECORD or printed as a resolution until that committee had reported on it. Now, if the Senator from Con-

necticut, who is a friend of mine, as I am his friend, says that the resolution gives any offense to him, I will withdraw it.

Mr. BINGHAM. I thank the Senator. Then, I will change my motion.

Mr. BLEASE. I am not withdrawing it because it might give any offense to the Negro race. I do not want the Senator to understand that to be the case.

Mr. BINGHAM. I ask the Senator from South Carolina to listen to the change I shall make in the motion. I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the resolution may be expunged from the RECORD.

Mr. BLEASE. I have no objection to that.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF TARIFF REVISION TO AGRICULTURAL SCHEDULE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read Senate Resolution 91, submitted by Mr. BORAH on the 13th instant, as follows:

Whereas it is the sense of the Senate that any amendment to the existing tariff law should be confined to agriculture and directly related products: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance is hereby instructed to limit its hearings, deliberations, recommendations, and report upon H. R. 2667 (the tariff bill) to the agricultural and directly related schedules.

Mr. BORAH obtained the floor.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I desire to offer an amendment to the resolution; and I will state that I have modified the amendment which I offered the other day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment, as modified, will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. At the end of line 4, before the period, it is proposed to insert:

and any other line of industry in which there is and has been during the past few years a substantial slackening of activity, with a consequent decrease of employment, due to insurmountable competition from imports of the products of such industry.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the adoption of the amendment would mean, in my judgment, the defeat of the resolution. I really do not see why we can not have a direct vote upon the resolution.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. In just a moment. It is perfectly clear to my mind, and I think it would be clear to the mind of anyone who would undertake to interpret the amendment, that there would be no limit to the revision which could be had under that amendment.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator think that his resolution, without the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, meets the promise made by the Republican platform which was drafted in the committee of which the Senator from Idaho was a member?

Mr. BORAH. I am going to discuss that subject, Mr. President. I can not answer that question "yes" or "no"; but let me say that if the House had passed a bill in accordance with the platform, this resolution never would have been offered. The first violation of the platform was the bill which was passed by the other body.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does not the Senator think that the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington actually does bring his resolution in line with the platform?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not. The special session was not in the mind of the makers of the platform.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. JONES. I just want to state that the amendment proposed by me conforms as nearly as I could conform it to the language of the President in his message calling Congress in extra session; and I can hardly agree with the suggestion of the

Senator that it practically broadens the investigation indefinitely. I think it makes the limitation that the President suggests in his message.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator is in a measure correct; but the House had before it the language of the President, and apparently gave no consideration whatever to the language of the President; and the organization of the Finance Committee of the Senate, and the statements made upon the floor by the majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee, indicate that they are not going to follow the President's language in any sense whatever. It becomes necessary therefore to restrict the language of the President's message in order to enforce its observance.

Mr. JONES. I hope they will follow it if we indorse it.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the junior Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DILL. Does not the Senator think that the words "directly related schedules" are so indefinite that he ought to name the schedules to which the committee is to be confined?

Mr. BORAH. I am going to discuss that matter in a minute; and I think at least I can state my position with reference to those words, and the position and view of those who were instrumental in framing the resolution.

Mr. President, I look upon tariff revision, so far as the special session is concerned, as a part of the program of farm relief. It was, in my judgment, so understood during the campaign; and my only object and purpose in offering this resolution is to have an understanding, determined by the vote of the Senate, as to whether we are sincerely to undertake to treat revision as a part of farm relief, or whether we are going to undertake a general revision of the tariff at this special session which was to be devoted to farm relief.

I recognize the fact that it is difficult to draw a resolution so specific as not to call for construction, and that a construction may be placed upon this resolution that is out of line with its attempted purpose; but my object in presenting the resolution is to secure the sense of the Senate as to whether we are going to undertake in good faith to revise the tariff schedules so far as they relate to farm products, and to treat tariff revision in this special session as an element of farm relief, or whether we are going to make farm relief purely incidental, and enter into a general revision of the tariff; and if we do enter upon a general revision of the tariff we may be assured that it will be an upward revision. So, Mr. President, instead of following what was indicated by the President—a limited revision—we are going to have a general revision, and a general revision upward.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for one question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. I do not want to interrupt the Senator, because I am very much interested to hear his viewpoint that inspired the resolution; but the very point he makes in regard to the schedules representing industry being unfair or unjust, or that they will be still further raised, leads me to ask this question:

How can we ascertain the injustice of the present or existing or increased schedules of an industrial nature if, through the passage of this resolution, we deliberately close all the usual avenues, through committee investigation, of securing information?

In other words, if the present law is unjust, or if it is assumed that a report from the Finance Committee will be more so, then would it not be all the more necessary to have the facts adduced by the Finance Committee, so that by the same vote on the floor of the Senate it might so direct the committee to confine itself to agriculture that we would be in a position to vote intelligently whether schedules of an industrial nature should be raised or lowered?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, as I said a moment ago, if there had been any evidence whatever of good faith in carrying out the language of the President's message to Congress, if there had been an effort to deal with the farm schedules and only such other schedules as would come within the terms of his message, this resolution would not have been offered. But a construction has been placed upon the message which was unjustified.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana and Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. But you may be assured of the fact that the evidence is at hand that the message of the

President has been and is to be disregarded, and we are to have here a general revision. That has been stated frankly by those who are in a position to state the program before the Senate.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I do.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator says that he is opposed to the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], does he not?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator says he is opposed to that; and yet the words of the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington are precisely the words of the President's message, and are exactly in line with the speech the President made in Boston during the campaign, and with the very idea which he put into the message calling this extra session together. Since the Senator is so interested in having the wishes of the President carried out, how can he object to what the Senator from Washington is attempting to do to carry them out?

Mr. BORAH. Do not misunderstand me. I am not so much interested in having the wishes of the President carried out as I am in having a revision of the tariff based upon the theory of farm relief, and in my opinion that is what the President intended by his language; and by reason of the fact that that language has been misconstrued, and is of such a nature that it covers the present situation as it is developing, I want to put a more restricted construction on that language in this resolution. I am by this resolution construing the President's message.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. It is the same language.

Mr. BORAH. I know it is the same language; but the House paid no attention to that language. The Senate Finance Committee are paying no attention to that language.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. Oh, I beg the Senator's pardon. If the Senator will look at the hearings of the only one of the subcommittees of the Finance Committee which I have been able to attend—namely, the one on the cotton schedule, which is now meeting—he will see that at the very opening of the hearings that language was read into the record, and the witnesses were told that it would be the effort of the committee to limit itself to carrying out that language; and yet the Senator says the Senate Finance Committee has made no such effort.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator knows perfectly well that that language is susceptible of a construction which will permit a revision of any schedules where the parties come in and claim that they are in a distressed condition.

Mr. BINGHAM. Provided they can prove it.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; provided they can prove it; but you are entering upon the entire proposition of tariff revision. You would not revise any schedule under any circumstances, at any session, unless the facts in your opinion sustained it; but you are permitting, under that resolution, a showing upon all schedules with which people may be dissatisfied. And it is easy to know what will be the result.

Mr. BINGHAM. But, as the Senator from New Jersey pointed out, if the Senator does not permit us to hold a hearing on the subject, how are we going to know whether these words cover the situation or whether the situation meets the President's message or not?

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield; and to whom?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] sought to interrupt me several minutes ago. I yield first to him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I am surprised at the statement of the Senator from Idaho that this resolution would not have been offered if the proposed revision in the House had not been so general. I do not see where the Senate has any special control over the House. The Senate presumably takes care of its own business.

Mr. BORAH. Well, we had a vote on the debenture in the House.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understood the Senator to say that the resolution offered by him is not in accord with the plank of the Republican platform which came from the resolutions committee, of which the Senator was a distinguished member. He also states that his resolution is not in entire accord with the language of the President which undertook to interpret that plank in the platform. His objection seems to be entirely that the House has done something he does not like. What warrant has the Senator for assuming that the Senate will not do what is right and proper, especially under the influence of the able Senator himself? Therefore, what reason

is there for his resolution? The Senator admits that his resolution never would have been offered if the House had done something to please him.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, there never was anything put in the platform, nor was anything said in the campaign or at any other time, indicating a general revision of the tariff at this special session. A fair construction of the language, so far as the special session is concerned, shows that it related to farm relief, and the revision which was to be had was to have in mind farm relief. The President did, in his message, owing to one or two schedules, such as textiles, open up the question, so that one could go beyond that, but the House took advantage of that and entered into a general revision, and the Senate Finance Committee proposes to do the same thing.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, how does the Senator know that the Senate will not do what it should?

Mr. BORAH. I have been here during three revisions of the tariff, and I know precisely what they will do.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Even so, Mr. President, if the Senator feels that the Senate would so far transgress the rules as to do something it should not do, how does he expect his resolution to prevent it, even if it were agreed to?

Mr. BORAH. If we have sufficient votes to pass the resolution, we will have sufficient votes to shape the revision, and I am starting early so that no one can claim estoppel.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If we have sufficient votes to pass the resolution, we have sufficient votes to pass a decent tariff law in the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. That is what I want to find out early.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Why can we not do that without any curbs of any kind?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Comparatively recently—that is, on January 16, 1928—the Senate adopted a resolution known as the McMaster resolution, in which it expressed itself in this language:

Resolved, That many of the rates in existing tariff schedules are excessive and that the Senate favors an immediate revision downward of such excessive rates, establishing a closer parity between agriculture and industry, believing it will result to the general benefit of all.

On the 16th of January, 1928, after weeks of debate on that resolution, with other clauses in it, the Senate adopted that resolution, thus declaring for a revision downward, by a vote of 54 to 34. So that so far as the Senate is concerned it quite recently announced a policy of revision downward. Now, we are told that revision upward is the program of the administration.

While this is being discussed, I would like to know who speaks for the President here. Some Senators say that the President wants a limited tariff revision, substantially as provided by the resolution of the Senator from Idaho, and other Senators say that he wants a general revision. Who knows?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, as far as I am personally concerned, I simply want to say this, in answer to my good friend the Senator from Arkansas: I am speaking with reference to the Republican platform that was adopted at Kansas City, which the Senator from Idaho helped to write. That is what I am interested in and what I am talking about, and what the Senator himself said goes farther than his resolution. He further states that his resolution never would have been offered had the House done what he desired it to do. Therefore it seems to be assumed by this resolution that the Senate is incapable of doing what is right.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE and Mr. BARKLEY addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I am going to yield to the Senator from California and then I would like to have the floor a few minutes myself.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I certainly do not approve of the procedure just now in progress, namely, interrupting a Senator when he rises to address himself seriously to a grave matter. I am not offending against my view by asking the Senator one question, and after I shall have asked the question I shall be very glad to remain silent and hear his answer and his reasons for the resolution pending.

I hold in my hand what purports to be one of the planks adopted by the last Republican National Convention, which reads as follows:

We realize that there are certain industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination, and, where necessary, a revision of these schedules, to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

I will be glad to have the Senator, before he shall have concluded, point out to us wherein the House bill as it comes to us has gone beyond the scope and the meaning and the purpose of that plank in the Republican platform. I do not invite an answer now, but before the Senator shall have finished I trust he will express his views touching that matter.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I hope the Senate in listening will keep in mind that when that platform was drawn and adopted there was no discussion, no contemplation, no thought of a special session. The special session arose out of the distress of agriculture, and the work of the special session, aside from any work which might be done at a general session, was to be devoted to farm relief. As I said in the opening, I look upon tariff revision at the special session as a part and parcel of the program of farm relief. That plank of the platform could be carried out, if it was to be carried out and carried out strictly and technically, at a regular session, but we are now dealing with a special session, which was called solely and exclusively for the purpose of dealing with farm relief.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, surely the Senator does not mean that.

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment. I mean just exactly what I say.

Let us deal with this matter from the standpoint of a special session. The announcement for a special session was made by the President on October 28, 1928. He said:

There are a number of questions, particularly agricultural relief, which urgently require solution and should not be delayed for a whole year. It is our most urgent economic problem.

We stated the same proposition in the platform at Kansas City, that the most urgent economic problem before the American people was that of farm relief, and it became so urgent during the progress of the campaign, not only economically but politically, that the President felt under the necessity of calling a special session to deal with it. That it is which brought us here, and now those who were opposed to a special session want to use it for their benefit.

Is there any Senator here who believes that we would be in session if it had not been for the farm condition? Would we have had any program at all to deal with prior to the general session if it had not been for the farm condition? We regarded that as urgent, as requiring specific and speedy action, and therefore the special session was called.

When the special session was called the President sent his message and indicated a limited revision of the tariff. It is true that he did not confine it entirely to farm relief, but he did confine it to limited revision.

Those who are here advocating the upholding of the President in his message have stated upon the floor that there should be no limited revision, that there should be a general revision, and the object and purpose of this resolution is to call the Senate back to the proposition of a limited revision.

Certainly it will not be contended that the President has not advocated and does not advocate now a limited revision. Certainly it will not be contended that he does not regard farm relief as the most urgent problem, and certainly it will not be contended that that is not uppermost in his mind when we are dealing with the tariff. In his speech at St. Louis the President said:

There has never been a national campaign into which so large a discussion of the agricultural problem has entered as in this campaign. This is as it should be. It is the most urgent, economic problem in our Nation to-day. * * *

Many factors enter into the solution of this whole problem. One is by the tariff to reserve to the farmer the American market; to safeguard him from the competition of imports of farm products. * * * Adequate tariff is essential if we would assure relief to the farmer.

At the present time, as I stated the other day, there are some \$2,500,000,000 worth of farm products coming into our markets in competition with the American farmer, and it was that which the President had in mind when he proposed to deal with tariff revision at the special session.

The only thing which led the President to modify his proposition was the consideration of the textiles schedule, and if the House had confined itself to that matter, or if the Senate Committee on Finance would confine itself to it, there would be

no occasion for this controversy at this time. But the House did not do so, the Senate Finance Committee does not propose to do so, and what I and others who are interested in is to know whether now, at this special session, not at a regular session but this special session, called for farm relief, we are going to enter upon a general revision of the tariff, in which the farmer will have a very inconsequential place, if the bill which passed the House is to be taken as a criterion, when we get through with it.

In his acceptance speech the President said:

The most urgent economic problem in our Nation to-day is in agriculture. * * * The working out of agricultural relief constitutes the most important obligation of the next administration.

Bearing in mind, therefore, that the President urged from the beginning that the farm problem was the most urgent problem; bearing in mind that it was because of that urgent problem that he called the special session; bearing in mind that he asked for limited revision—the test upon this resolution will be whether we are to have a limited revision or a general revision.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does not the Senator think that the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] calls for limited revision in precisely the same words used by the President in calling the extra session?

Mr. BORAH. If I should construe it, I think it could be so construed; but if the Senate Finance Committee construes it, it will not be so construed.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if the committees of the House and the Senate have paid no attention to the original language of the President, would they be any more impressed by its repetition in the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. The amendment offered by the Senator from Washington is perfectly satisfactory to those who are for general revision. It will be found when the vote is cast that all those in favor of general revision will vote for the amendment, and it will be perfectly satisfactory to them.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I will yield the floor pretty soon.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator think that his resolution would permit the discussion of tariff on textiles?

Mr. BORAH. My opinion is it would not, because if you let down the bars advantage will be taken to bring in everything.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, the Senator admits that his resolution goes much more drastically against what the President wished than any possible construction of the Senator from Washington.

Mr. BORAH. There are those who believe that under my resolution textiles could be included. I do not think so myself. The resolution was not so intended at the time it was drawn. But I will say to the Senator, and I will say to those who are opposed to the resolution, if they will confine themselves to farm schedules and textiles alone, there will be no controversy. But that is not what has been done; it is not what you propose to do. You propose to disregard the President's message, just as was done in the House.

Mr. BINGHAM. No, Mr. President; so far as I am concerned, I propose to follow it; but the President has certainly never limited it to textiles. The President specifically stated that he was interested and wanted us to look into a study of those industries "in which there has been a substantial slackening of activity during the past few years, and consequent decrease of employment."

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator just stated that some thought that under his resolution textiles would be included, and that others thought not. That is a fine example, I think, of the indefiniteness of the Senator's resolution, by which he would transfer to the Finance Committee a debate on whether or not things were included under the resolution. I again ask the Senator whether it would not be in the interest of clarity and swiftness of action by the committee for us to name the schedules to be included in the resolution?

Mr. BORAH. Of course, Mr. President, there are industries in the State of every Senator which would be cut out under the resolution. I realized that when the resolution was introduced. I have telegrams from my State, and undoubtedly every Sena-

tor has received similar messages, asking for duties upon articles which would not be covered under this resolution. The simple question presented by the resolution is whether Senators having those interests in their respective States are willing to surrender their views in regard to them during the special session and devote the special session to farm relief. Are we willing to do what we promised to do in this special session for farm relief. That is the real test under the resolution.

Mr. DILL. But the Senator has not answered my question as to indefiniteness.

Mr. BORAH. I do not think it is indefinite. When we say farm schedules, and those things which are directly related to it, I do not think it is indefinite. Of course, just what articles would be included would depend somewhat upon the hearings, but we could not have said farm schedules alone, because that would raise the question that if we passed, say upon hides, we certainly would have to deal with leather and shoes. But it is those commodities, and those only, which spring directly from the change which is made in certain agricultural products that will be benefited. I myself do not think that textiles would be included.

Mr. DILL. But the Senator does think there is room for an honest difference of opinion?

Mr. BORAH. I do not think they should be included.

Mr. GLENN and Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BORAH. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. GLENN. The Senator mentioned just now the hide and shoe schedules. Of course, our State is very greatly interested in both of those schedules. Is it the Senator's idea that the revision of the tariff should be considered as to hides and as to shoes alike?

Mr. BORAH. I think under the resolution if we put hides upon the dutiable list we would have to consider the other proposition because they would be directly affected.

Mr. GLENN. What would be the distinction between that situation and the situation existing as to cotton and wool?

Mr. BORAH. There is no duty on cotton and we are not likely to put on one.

Mr. BINGHAM. What about wool?

Mr. BORAH. I think wool would be included.

Mr. ODDIE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. ODDIE. Does the Senator from Idaho then feel that hides should be barred from consideration by the committee under his resolution?

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Idaho has intimated nothing of the kind. Undoubtedly hides would come under the resolution.

Mr. ODDIE. Would hides be barred from consideration by the resolution, in the opinion of the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. ODDIE. Hides could be considered then if the Senator's resolution passes?

Mr. BORAH. Certainly they could be considered.

Mr. ODDIE. Then I want to ask the Senator from Idaho if metals and minerals will be considered?

Mr. BORAH. No, indeed. They are not agricultural products, though I may lose the Senator's vote thereby. Metals would not be included.

Mr. ODDIE. Does not the Senator realize that manganese is a very necessary product in farm relief? If we can get more manganese for farm relief it would be very helpful. Agricultural authorities have found that manganese is a very important item in the matter of increasing agricultural crop growth.

Mr. BORAH. Now we have a magnificent exhibition of those who have been construing the President's message and of those who are construing the declarations in the campaign. There is no duty, no article, no commodity anywhere to be found that would not come under the rule as the Senator would construe it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is not a construction of the President's message. It is a construction of the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho. I can find nothing in the President's message which says we shall consider only agriculture and matters related thereto. It very specifically states that there are probably many other industries which are to be considered.

Mr. BORAH. No; the President did not refer to agriculture alone, but he did refer to a certain rule by which we were to test the question of whether or not the schedule was to be

dealt with, and that rule is utterly disregarded because it is said the farmer is in the United States and that he is affected in some way by anything that anybody else may do in the United States, and therefore farm relief is involved in any schedule which may come up.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I was astounded a while ago to see one or two on the Republican side shake their heads when the Senator from Idaho said that hides should be considered under his resolution. In order to make a record of it, I think the Senator's view of it and mine are in accord. I understand items such as hides, beef, mutton, and wool, and those things produced by the farmer would fall squarely within his resolution. Is that the view of the Senator?

Mr. BORAH. That is my view. When we met here in 1921 we enacted the emergency tariff law dealing with agricultural products alone. There was no discussion whatever over the proposition that it was impracticable to do it, that we could not deal with agricultural products without dealing with other products, but we passed through the Senate an agricultural tariff bill dealing with agricultural products alone. If we would act in good faith, in accordance with the spirit of the campaign, we would come into this special session knowing that it is limited and give as scientific and thoughtful consideration to the various agricultural schedules as it is possible to do. Then if we want a general revision, if the President or Congress wants a general revision of the entire subject of tariff, it can be dealt with in the future. We are not asking to lower your schedules. God knows they are high enough. They were almost embargoes when the last tariff act was passed. We are not asking to lower them, but we are asking that the farmer be placed upon an economic equality, and the only way to do it is to give him help in accordance with and to the amount of the protection which industry already has.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator in answer to the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] said that shoes would come under the resolution because of hides. That, of course, interprets his resolution for the committee. Will not the Senator interpret other subjects so the committee may have the benefit of his advice, or is it to be decided by the committee?

Mr. BORAH. To be candid, I do not think shingles would be included. [Laughter.]

Mr. DILL. I am not arguing about shingles, although I think in my State shingles are a matter of farm relief because 100,000 men would be able to go back to work if shingles were properly provided for. But I am not going to argue that question now. I was speaking from the standpoint of the definiteness or indefiniteness of the resolution. I want to know whether, if the Senator should state that in his opinion shoes and hides should be considered and textiles should not, that opinion is binding on the committee?

Mr. BORAH. I expect the committee in good faith to interpret the resolution in view of the evidence that is developed. There are some things which might appeal to us as coming under the resolution as directly relating to the farm schedules. There are some things we think of immediately. There may be other things which the evidence will develop as being related to the farm schedule. But I assume that the committee will undertake first to deal with the farm schedule, and, secondly, to find what is affected by reason of the fact that they have changed the tariff schedule in that regard. I am willing that the resolution shall go to them for construction.

Mr. BRATTON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from New Mexico?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BRATTON. I want to correct a statement made by the Senator from Washington. He said the Senator from Idaho stated, in response to a question propounded by me, that shoes would come under the resolution. The Senator from Idaho did not make that observation in response to a question propounded by me. My question was confined to hides, beef, mutton, sheep, and wool. I do not think that shoes would come under the resolution, but I do not want to have the RECORD indicate that I agreed with that statement.

Mr. BORAH. If we were here in the same spirit to-day to do this work that we were in 1921, there would be no difficulty whatever in carrying out the resolution. If Senators will turn

back to the debates in 1921 they will find there was not a single suggestion as to difficulty in dealing with farm schedules without dealing with all other schedules which might directly or indirectly be affected. They will find that we proceeded with all due dispatch to place a tariff law upon the statute books dealing with farm schedules alone. I do not desire to be harsh, but I undertake to say that the spirit in which the campaign was fought and the spirit in which the campaign was won in the agricultural States has departed from the councils and is not now controlling the shaping of legislation.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. SWANSON addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. BORAH. I will yield first to the Senator from Virginia, and then I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. SWANSON. If I understand the position of the Senator from Idaho, he voted against the Fordney-McCumber tariff bill. He thought there was not an equality of treatment between the farming interests and the industrial interests. Consequently he voted against that measure. If I remember correctly, the then Senator La Follette voted against it, he being another Progressive Republican, feeling that the industrial interests of the country had received greater benefits than agriculture had received.

The position of the Senator from Idaho now is that the extraordinary session of Congress was called to give relief to the farm industry. He believes that the inequality existing under the present tariff law ought to be equalized by the special session of Congress, and then if it is desired to have a general tariff bill after the equalization is made, it can be done at the general session. But I understand the Senator to insist that Congress was called into extraordinary session to create economic equality, so far as the tariff is concerned, between the industrial interests and the producing farmers' interests, and having been called here for that purpose it ought to confine its legislation to that purpose. The Senator says if there is any general tariff legislation after that, it can occur at the regular session. That is the position of the Senator, is it not?

Mr. BORAH. That is right.

Mr. SWANSON. And then that all industries which are included in the tariff act known as the Fordney-McCumber Act, on account of the increased rates on farm products, if they affect manufactured products, ought to be compensated because of the increase. The issue, as I understand it, is this: Shall we produce economic equality first at this extraordinary session between the industrial interests and the producing farmers' interests, and after the equality is produced then at the regular session have a general tariff bill if the Republicans favor it, which I think would be a great calamity for the people of the country?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator referred to the rule of interpretation a few moments ago. I wonder if he objected to the rule or yardstick or test laid down by the President in his message calling this extraordinary session into being.

Mr. BORAH. I do not object to the yardstick as the President announced it, but I do object to the yardstick as it is being utilized by those whose power it is to utilize it. I am going to put some new directions on that yardstick if I can.

Mr. BINGHAM. The President specifically laid down in his message the test of necessity for revision, not as to whether the article produced would benefit or hurt the farmer, but as to whether there had been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years. The Senator also seems to say very plainly that there is bad faith due to the fact that during the campaign the tariff situation was discussed merely as an agricultural measure and not as applying to industry. But may I call his attention to the fact that the platforms of the Democratic Party and the Republican Party alike referred to the necessity of safeguarding the American laborer by discovering the actual difference between the cost of production at home and abroad—and those words I quote from the Democratic platform.

Mr. BORAH. Why is it the Senator gets so much more enjoyment out of making a speech in my time than he would if he should make it in his own time?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hope the Senator will answer those arguments.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Virginia?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. GLASS. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] disposed of the Senator from Washington [Mr. DILL] awhile ago by assuring him that shingles are not regarded as a staple farm product. The Senator from Connecticut might be quieted in the same way if the Senator from Idaho would assure him that wooden nutmegs would not be included either. [Laughter.]

Mr. BORAH. I am always glad to hear from the Senator from Connecticut, but it is more agreeable to proper procedure in debate for each Senator to make his speech in his own time. I know exactly what is the matter with the Senator from Connecticut; I know precisely how he feels about this matter, and if we were in regular session here I would not have any quarrel with him about the matter. But there was never any indication in the Kansas City convention or anywhere else that we were going to undertake a general revision of the tariff at this special session. The special session was to be dedicated to another purpose entirely. The Senator is talking about a resolution in the platform which related to the general policy of the party which might be carried out at a regular session of Congress; but the special session was not called for that purpose. The special session was called in part for a limited revision of the tariff. Now, the majority leader and the chairman of the Finance Committee say that we are going to have no limited revision; they say we are going to have a general revision. Who is it that is following the President's request? Who is it that is following the suggestion with reference to the special session when the leaders on this side say we are not going to have a limited revision, but are going to have a general revision?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, with all due respect to my distinguished friend, it seems to me that the Senator's resolution violates the President's request more than anything else that has happened.

Mr. BORAH. The resolution of the Senator from Idaho does provide for a limited revision.

Mr. BINGHAM. But of itself it violates the President's request as to what the revision should be.

Mr. BORAH. It may provide for a more limited revision than the President requested, but the President did request a limited revision; the President's declaration was for a limited revision, which the Republican leaders are disregarding entirely, and, by reason of their disregarding that, it has become necessary to put a construction upon it to test here the question as to how far we are going.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, if the Senator will pardon me again, the platform which he and I helped to draw did pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination of the tariff; and this is the next Republican Congress.

Mr. BORAH. Yes; but the Senator is not sincere about that. The Senator knows perfectly well that we had no idea at all at that time of a special session, and that the special session came by reason of farm distress and that alone. When the Senator helped to write that platform, as I did, if anybody had put in there the words "at a special session," it would have been killed instantly; it never could have gone into the platform. We never contemplated a special session until farm distress forced it upon us. Congress is now in session for that purpose and that purpose only, and we are not in good faith carrying out the pledge which we made to the agricultural interests of the country if we undertake a general revision of the tariff at this time.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator dislikes to have any remarks made in his speech, but if he will pardon me, the Senator is responsible for this extraordinary session, is he not?

Mr. BORAH. I would not want to assume that responsibility, although I would be very glad if I could have it.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator had a very large part in securing the extra session. The pledge for an extra session came fairly early in the campaign, did it not?

Mr. BORAH. Not fairly early; it never came until the 26th of October. What was the Senator doing?

Mr. BINGHAM. The pledge did not come until the 26th of October?

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. BINGHAM. During the campaign the President in his Boston speech made reference to the necessity for tariff revision.

Mr. BORAH. But that was before the declaration for a special session.

The Senator has mentioned my connection with the special session. I gave out a statement within 20 minutes after I had had a conversation with the President about the condition in the agricultural States. I came from Joplin, Mo., for the purpose of a conference with the President upon that situation. I had a conference with the President, and I gave out

this statement within 20 minutes after that, and this is the construction of the President's view at that time—

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to say that I am in no sense charging him with unfairness or with having changed his mind or with having misled anyone in the campaign, and I object to his charging me and others who spoke on Republican platforms in the industrial States with unfairness. We certainly led our hearers to believe that as soon as Congress met there would be a revision of the tariff in such a degree as industry and unemployment demanded.

Mr. BORAH. Did the Senator ever mention a special session in his speeches?

Mr. BINGHAM. I do not remember, Mr. President—

Mr. BORAH. No.

Mr. BINGHAM. But I certainly repeatedly mentioned the fact that the laborers in the factories might expect that as soon as a Republican Congress met we would have a revision of the tariff where it was needed for the purpose of reducing unemployment. I dislike to have the Senator charge me with unfairness. I am not charging him with changing his views, and he must not charge me with doing so.

Mr. BORAH. I say that when the Senator undertakes to apply the general declarations with reference to the policy of the party which had in contemplation a regular session to a special session he is unfair; that he is not dealing fairly with those to whom the special-session pledge was made.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator gives much emphasis to the words "special session." I agree with him, in that I do not think a special session was contemplated in the early part of the campaign, so far as that is concerned, but the fact remains that we are now in special session; we are considering the subject; we have all the machinery with which to consider the subject; the House has held hearings for weeks and weeks, and the Senate committee has subdivided and is holding further hearings. In view of the interpretation given in connection with the platform, is there any good reason why the Finance Committee should not receive and consider the complaints that come from so many citizens engaged in industries that need tariff protection?

Mr. BORAH. Why did not the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Connecticut talk about that when they were discussing the matter in the campaign?

Mr. EDGE. I did on every occasion when I discussed the tariff.

Mr. BORAH. I will read what the Senator said.

Mr. EDGE. Oh, I discussed that question.

Mr. BORAH. I will read what the Senator said.

Mr. EDGE. I will be glad to hear it.

Mr. BORAH. On the next day or the same day when the President issued his call for the special session on farm relief the Senator from New Jersey himself said:

I discussed the situation with Mr. Hoover the last time I was in Washington, and I knew he was giving it serious consideration. I think it is a very wise move, and it will be possible to do something for farm relief at that session.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator from New Jersey apparently was discussing the proposed special session in response to a question asked him by some representative of the press; but did he in any way infer that at the time that subject was being considered he would absolutely pay no attention to the claims of that class of citizens who thought that they needed some relief? The Senator can not read that into the statement at all.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes. Mr. President, a special session was very unpopular with a large number of people, and particularly here in the Senate, and it was debated a long time whether or not it would be wise to call a special session on account of that situation. It was the agricultural States of the West which suffered economic inequality and were struggling to preserve their home market that compelled the special session. It never would have been called for any other purpose. I say that those gentlemen who were not wanting a special session but who were discouraging the calling of a special session, some of them doing so directly to the President, are now in favor of utilizing the extra session in order to protect their own particular interests and to make the farmer an inconsequential factor in the whole program.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. Has the Senator any evidence of any kind whatsoever that Senators from so-called industrial States, in which class I presume he would place me, are not sympathetic with the farmers' problem? I have spent three or four days since the Committee on Finance has been in session listening to those who have appeared in behalf of the chemical schedule,

and I should say that almost 90 per cent of the witnesses who have appeared before that committee have discussed what I assume are matters directly connected with agriculture in connection with chemicals, such as casein, and other commodities of that character. I have found a disposition on the part of the committee, so far as I can interpret it, in connection with the witnesses who have come before the committee up to this time in relation to that schedule, to lower more rates rather than to raise them. Does the Senator take the position that a Senator from an industrial State has absolutely no sympathy with the farmers' trouble? I do not know of a single schedule that has been proposed by the representatives of the farming States for which I have not voted.

Mr. BORAH. I think the Senator has sympathy for them.

The Senator from Connecticut made reference to my part in the calling of the special session, and I did not get through discussing it. I am not at liberty, of course, to state all that happened; but I can state enough to make my position clear. I say that the special session originated solely with the question of granting farm relief.

Mr. BINGHAM. Was anything said about reapportionment?

Mr. BORAH. No; nothing was said about it.

Mr. REED. Or about national origins?

Mr. BORAH. Nothing was said about that.

Mr. BINGHAM. Did the Senator object to those questions being considered?

Mr. BORAH. Those are matters that were presented and acted upon here under the call for a special session without interfering with farm relief.

Mr. BINGHAM. Why did not the Senator introduce a resolution declaring it to be the sense of the Senate that we ought not to consider those questions?

Mr. BORAH. We had not at that time any farm question before us.

Mr. BINGHAM. We always have had that question before us.

Mr. BORAH. Will not the Senator rise and address the Chair so that I may get the drift of what he says? I do not want to lose anything.

After coming away from the interview with the President on October 26, I said:

I am thoroughly in favor of an extra session of Congress. I would like to see the session called at once to first pass a tariff bill with the single view of increasing duties upon farm products.

I undertake to say at the time the suggestion of an extra session originated there was no discussion, no intimation, and no reference to any other schedule than the farm schedule. That was the beginning of the special session. The other matter was brought in afterwards for certain reasons but not during the campaign.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. I wish to ask the Senator a question, for I am very deeply interested in what he is saying. Does not the Senator think that if by appropriate tariff legislation we can aid a manufacturing industry which to-day is languishing that will be of benefit to agriculture in this, that it will develop a market for the products of the farm?

Mr. BORAH. Oh, yes. What I am trying to do is to save that market which is being developed. The farmer has been told for 40 years that if he would be loyal to the protective tariff we would build up a home market, a home market more steady and more reliable, and therefore the protective tariff would be of great benefit to him. We built up the home market, and the American farmer was loyal to the protective system, but now the home market is in the possession of the foreigner. What I want to do at this special session is to take that home market out of the possession of the foreigner.

I do not care how much more it may be built up if we will give it over and dedicate it to the American farmer. At the present time there are some products of the farm which are driven out of the home market. The American farmer will have no recess. When he gets to the market he will find, if we take a recess, that it is still in the possession of the foreigner. I say that it is our duty first and speedily to throw the protection of tariff duties around the home market, and when we have done that we can take up the general proposition of tariff revision.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. The best market that the farmers in New England have for their products is afforded by those who labor in the mills, many of whom are now unemployed. Does the

Senator think by preventing us from taking up schedules affecting those New England industries which are in trouble that he is going to help the farmers of New England to sell their products?

Mr. BORAH. O Mr. President, the Senator from Connecticut is talking now about what Mr. McKinley told us years ago, that the New England market was the safeguard and surety of the American farmer, and it was, at the time when McKinley was speaking.

Mr. BINGHAM. I am referring to the Connecticut farmer chiefly.

Mr. BORAH. I know and I want to refer to something chiefly. It was when Mr. McKinley was speaking. We were seeking to build up the great consuming markets of New England and we did. We built them up by the protective tariff. Now what has New England done?—if the Senator wants to raise that question. It has been the leader in the reciprocity campaign in this country to give that market over to Canada and Argentina and Mexico.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, the Senator is very unfair if he is implying that I propose to vote against any of the increases in the agricultural schedules. In the House bill there are something over 136 changes in the agricultural schedule directly concerning the farmer.

Mr. SMOOT. There are 115, which is a greater number, less two, than in all the other schedules combined.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. SMOOT. I say that there are as many changes in the agricultural schedule as in all the other schedules, with the exception of two.

Mr. BORAH. Let us not talk about the niceties and the percentages, and so forth. What we want is the home market. We have not got it. What we are asking you to do is to give it to us, and to give it to us now. Then after the home market has been turned over to the American farmer, if you want to revise your schedules, that is your business; and the West has always supported you when you have been reasonable.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator need not look at me in that way and imply that I want a general revision of the tariff where it is not needed and does not specifically come under the test provided by the President in his message. But there can be no market for farm products among people who are out of work and whose factories are being closed; and that is the situation that I believe we should meet, and which we were specifically called together to meet.

Mr. BORAH. I know the Senator does not want any protection where it is not needed; but I have been here through three revisions, and I know what the word "needed" means. It not only means existence, as it does with the farmer now, but it means profits, and it means very large profits. What we are asking for is the right of existence. That is what the farmer is asking for.

Mr. BINGHAM. And that is what certain Connecticut manufacturers are asking for who, if the Senator's resolution goes through, will have to go to the wall and close their factories, and their men will be out of work. They are asking for existence, too.

Mr. BORAH. If the bill had been confined to that we might have a different situation. Let us discuss some of the things that are in the House bill.

Mr. BINGHAM. We can not even confine ourselves to it if the Senator's resolution goes through. We can not even investigate it.

Mr. BORAH. As an illustration of what is regarded as needed, the House put a duty upon cement. I have here a statement from a gentleman who is very familiar with that industry. He says:

The modern cement mills in the eastern district, principally Pennsylvania and New York, use less labor to-day per barrel of output than they did prior to the war; and while labor has increased at the mills by possibly 30 per cent or 40 per cent above the pre-war cost, when it is definitely ascertained that the labor factor in a barrel of Portland cement prior to the war was about 10 cents, a 30 per cent or 40 per cent increase in labor could only mean about 5 per cent or 7 per cent extra to be charged to the present cost. The proposed duty of 30 cents per barrel on Portland cement, if put into effect, will impose an extra cost of 80 cents for each lineal yard of highway 20 feet wide, and this is about equal to \$14 a mile.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield for a suggestion, the tariff fixed on cement in the House bill is 8 cents per hundred pounds.

Mr. BORAH. How much is that a barrel?

Mr. REED. About 30 cents. The Senator said 30 cents a hundred pounds.

Mr. BORAH. No; I said 30 cents a barrel.

Mr. REED. Then I apologize for interrupting the Senator.

Mr. BORAH. This statement continues:

It might surprise you to learn that the price of Portland cement shipped into the New York market from Pennsylvania has not varied a fraction of a cent per barrel on the f. o. b. car price for nearly two and a half years. This should be positive proof that there exists to-day a close understanding among the Portland-cement manufacturers to maintain prices; and against this evidence they are asking for a duty where the total import of foreign cement in the United States is equal to only 1½ per cent.

That is one of the schedules which the House took care of in its program of granting relief to the farmer.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask one question there?

Mr. BORAH. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. It seems to me that cement can be used as an illustration as well as many other commodities, perhaps, in the House bill. The fact remains that, rightly or wrongly, that is in the House bill—cement, 8 cents per hundred pounds, or approximately 30 cents per barrel. In view of the fact that one-half of the legislative machinery has been gone through, and that is in the bill, the House have their rights. We, of course, have no question in our minds as to that, especially in the initiation of a tariff bill. Now, we must meet that on the floor. Why, then, is it not all the more businesslike to permit the Finance Committee of the Senate to get the other side of that story?

The Senator quotes a letter from some one, no doubt an authority, giving his view; but the Senator proposes to prohibit the Finance Committee from getting a complete review of the wisdom of that schedule as well as many others. Certainly, as a matter of practical mechanics, when the bill comes before the Senate, if the Finance Committee is prohibited from considering these schedules, there will be amendments offered on the floor. Many other matters will undoubtedly be under discussion.

I should think, in order to justify the Senator's viewpoint, that he would want all the information we could adduce in the Finance Committee, because we are going to meet that argument on the floor just the same. It is a part of the bill at this minute. The bill must go to conference. In other words, we can not bodily throw out the House provisions. We can, of course, in effect; but they go to conference just the same. Why is it not the proper and businesslike thing to do, I repeat, to have all the information we can secure in order to debate that question freely here, and not close the avenues of information?

Mr. BORAH. Now, Mr. President, what does a general revision mean?

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, is not the Senator going to answer that question? If the Senator will pardon me, I should really like to know what his objection is to our securing the information, using our best judgment about it, and bringing it on the floor of the Senate, where he and those who think like him, if they agree that it is improper, can vote the amendment down or vote the original part of the bill down.

Mr. BORAH. Are the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Connecticut through now?

Mr. BINGHAM. I hoped the Senator would answer that question.

Mr. BORAH. Of course, I should prefer to conduct my speech in my own way; but I will yield to the Senator from Connecticut and I will conduct it according to his suggestion.

Mr. President, I do not care anything about the information upon that proposition, because I do not want to consider that schedule at this session at all.

Mr. BINGHAM. No matter how much it may be needed?

Mr. BORAH. I do not care anything about it at this special session. I do not want to consider it at this special session. I want to limit the revision at this special session to farm products. That is the reason why I am opposing the consideration of these other schedules. Of course, if I were going to consider those schedules, I should want information upon both sides; but what I am seeking to do is to cut out at this special session all schedules except farm schedules.

Mr. EDGE. But, Mr. President, this other matter is already in the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Exactly; and if you will bring it in here we can take it out in a few minutes.

Mr. EDGE. Without information?

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, we can not take it out so that it will not be in conference. The House has acted. What does the Senator want the committee to do—have no bill at all? That is what would be the result in conference.

Mr. BORAH. Does the Senator assume now that because it was in conference we would have to yield on it?

Mr. SMOOT. No; but we would have to yield on it, more than likely, if we desired to have any legislation at this session.

Mr. BORAH. Very well, Mr. President. If that is the situation, we might just as well know it here upon this 17th day of June, 1929, because there are those of us in this Chamber who now say, since that has been said by the Senator, that if anything like the House bill comes in here, if it is within their power, we are not going to have any legislation.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the first time I have heard such a statement made or intimated. I have never heard it before from a Senator or from anyone outside.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has just said that unless we yield to the House on this, of course we will have no bill.

Mr. SMOOT. No; I did not say that positively. I said that the House would have a say as to the provisions in the House bill, and if they would not yield to our proposition then we could have no bill. It is not a question of what the Senate would do; the conferees on the part of the Senate would be instructed to contend for the Senate's position; but the House might disagree with the Senate conferees.

Mr. BORAH. Oh, I understand all that. Why lecture here upon what the House may do? I understand all that; but what I say is: If the House conferees take the position that things like cement and glass and iron and steel and those other matters that they have dealt with are to go into this bill or we would have no bill, so far as I am individually concerned, I will meet them on that proposition.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that they may not go in the bill when we report it.

Mr. BINGHAM and Mr. KING addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. To whom does the Senator yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator take the position that he would rather not have any increases in the agricultural schedules than let certain very seriously crippled industries secure the protection which they need at this time?

Mr. BORAH. Oh, no; but I take the position that if certain of these schedules that are now in the House bill come into your bill, I having investigated them, if they must stay there or have no bill, we will have no bill if I can prevent it.

Mr. BINGHAM. Certain schedules?

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. BINGHAM. But not all of them?

Mr. BORAH. No; not all of them; but I have investigated the subjects of glass and cement and other things, and I know there is not a shadow of justification for the schedules which they have sent here.

Mr. REED. What kind of glass, Mr. President? Will the Senator specify?

Mr. BORAH. Every kind.

Mr. REED. The bill does not increase the present duties on plate glass or window glass.

Mr. BORAH. I said every kind that is in the bill. There is pretty nearly everything there, from a glass eye to a mirror. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. The Senator will find, I think, that the present duties were fixed by the President after consideration of the facts presented by the Tariff Commission. The House bill merely reaffirms the decision of the President. Does the Senator think we are going to succeed in getting the House to recede from that?

Mr. BORAH. I said that I do not know what the House is going to do. I am simply saying what I am going to do. I do not know what the House will do. I am, however, controlling my own course.

Mr. President, when interrupted by the Senator from Connecticut or the Senator from New Jersey, I had started to ask, What does a general revision mean? The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], the leader of the majority, said the other day that in his opinion a general revision meant no bill; and that is my opinion, too. If we have a recess, go away from here for five or six weeks, and come back in the middle of August or the first of September and have a general revision here, it will be practically impossible to put through a general revision by the 1st day of December. The Payne-Aldrich bill was here five months, I think; and, in my opinion, a general revision will inevitably result in such delay that we will be practically unable to get anything like a satisfactory bill by the 1st of December.

In my judgment it is not fair, it is not just to the American farmer, to ask him to wait here until we can adjust all these other matters which were no part of the campaign and no part

in the pledge, and take the chance, in addition to that, of not having any protection at all.

Now, Mr. President, just a word in conclusion.

One thing will not be denied, that the great dominating, controlling issue of the campaign was to place the farmer upon an economic equality with the other parts of the country. Nobody will deny that that was the controlling, dominating pledge in the campaign so far as the matters with which we are now dealing were concerned. It was admitted at Kansas City, it was admitted all through the campaign, it was admitted here when the special session was called, that the farmer was not upon an economic equality with the rest of the country. Therefore we pledged speedy legislation for the purpose of bringing that about. The second proposition, which was perfectly plain, was that we were going to legislate as speedily as possible for the purpose of bringing about an economic equality. The great, dominating questions in the campaign were the protection of the farmer, economic equality for the farmer, and speedy relief for the farmer.

The special session was called for that purpose. If we go into a general revision, the chances are, first, that it will be indefinitely delayed. Another chance is that the bill will not be passed at all. The special session which was called for the farmer will have gone by without relief being provided for him. Secondly, if we go into a general revision, if it is in consonance with any tariff revision I have ever seen, the raising of the prices of the things which the farmer has to buy will outweigh by far the amount of duty the farmer will secure upon his own products.

Understand me, therefore, Mr. President, that I am pleading only for the action of the special session. I am not attacking these industries. I do not know what their situation is except as to those which I have examined in the bill which passed the House. What I am asking is that the special session be devoted to farm relief.

Mr. HEBERT. Mr. President, I should like to address myself briefly to the subject matter of the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

While I am in sympathy with the aims of those Senators who are endeavoring to secure the relief which agriculture needs, yet I am not unmindful of the fact that the conditions in industry in this country demand some measure of consideration. Therefore I am opposed to the resolution of the distinguished Senator from Idaho, which would limit the hearings, deliberations, recommendations, and report of the Committee on Finance upon H. R. 2667, the pending tariff bill, to the agricultural and directly related schedules.

I have come here, as a representative of my State, with a mandate to favor protection for American industries so clear that I could not, in justice to myself, disregard it. Were I to favor any postponement by the Senate of the consideration of tariff legislation as it affects industry I should feel that I had been recreant to my trust; and that I shall not do.

If there was any one issue clearly before the people of this country at the election of 1928, so far as my own State is concerned, it was the tariff issue. It was discussed by all candidates for office throughout the campaign. It was clearly defined. It was well understood by the voters, and so important was it considered, not only by the people of my State but by the candidates who sought the support of the electorate, that Democrats, as well as Republicans, were open advocates of a system of adequate protection to our industries; and they promised, if elected, that they would support measures to accomplish that end. This, in brief, is my justification, if indeed one be needed, for assuming to speak thus early during my term of service in this body.

There has been considered and passed at the present special session of Congress a bill designed to provide relief for agriculture. I voted in favor of that measure; and while I do not see in its provisions a panacea for all of the ills of agriculture in this country, yet I do expect that it will bring about better conditions in those activities through a broader understanding of the problems with which they are concerned. It is a beginning. We may be, and I think we shall be, called upon to legislate further in behalf of agriculture; but in my opinion the present law will be only a halfway measure, if indeed it amounts to that, unless there be coupled with it a consideration of possible and necessary changes in the tariff law now on our statute books.

In my advocacy of tariff legislation at this time I am only adhering to the declaration of the Republican Party in its platform adopted at Kansas City in 1928, as well as to the pronouncements of the President of the United States during the campaign following that convention and since.

On the question of the tariff, I quote from that platform:

Nor have these manifest benefits been restricted to any particular section of the country. They are enjoyed throughout the land either directly or indirectly. Their stimulus has been felt in industries, farming sections, trade circles, and communities in every quarter. However, we realize that there are special industries which can not now successfully compete with foreign producers because of lower foreign wages and a lower cost of living abroad, and we pledge the next Republican Congress to an examination and, where necessary, a revision of these schedules, to the end that American labor in these industries may again command the home market, may maintain its standard of living, and may count upon steady employment in its accustomed field.

In his address of acceptance, delivered at Stanford University, California, August 11, 1928, Mr. Hoover, in speaking on the subject of commerce and industries, said:

Commerce and industry have revived. Although the agricultural, coal, and textile industries still lag in their recovery and still require our solicitude and assistance, yet they have made substantial progress. While other countries engaged in the war are only now regaining their pre-war level in foreign trade, our exports, even if we allow for their depreciated dollar, are 58 per cent greater than before the war. Constructive leadership and cooperation by the Government have released and stimulated the energies of our people. Faith in the future has been restored. Confidence in our form of government has therefore been greater.

In his address delivered in Boston on October 15, 1928, Mr. Hoover, speaking upon the tariff, referred to it as one of the most important economic issues of the campaign. Speaking of the Tariff Commission, he referred to it as a most valuable arm of the Government. He added, however:

But the American people will never consent to delegating authority over the tariff to any commission, whether nonpartisan or bipartisan. Our people have a right to express themselves at the ballot upon so vital a question as this. There is only one commission to which delegation of that authority can be made. That is the great commission of their own choosing—the Congress of the United States and the President.

And he added:

No tariff act is perfect. With the shifting of economic tides some items may be higher than necessary, but undoubtedly some are too low. This is particularly true so far as New England is concerned. New England has many protected industries. One important branch of them, the cotton and woolen industries, have not for the past few years been in a satisfactory condition. They comprise about 26 per cent of New England's industrial life. Their depressed condition has not been peculiar to New England. The same situation is prevalent throughout the world and is due largely to the same factors—style changes, production in new areas, and decided changes in the trends of consumption.

Any change in the present policy of production would, without question, result in a flood of foreign textile products, which would mean no less than ruin to New England industries, both manufactures and workmen.

These are some of the pronouncements which the voters of my State had in mind; these are some of the promises upon which they relied when they cast their ballots at the election last November.

To be more specific in relation to the present state of the textile industry in New England I have prepared a table, which I will ask to have inserted in the body of my remarks, showing the dividends paid by the cotton industry of New Bedford and Fall River, Mass., since the passage of the tariff bill of 1922. It shows, for example, that the average annual dividends paid to their stockholders by the cotton mills of those cities in 1922 averaged from \$8 per annum in Fall River to \$9.72 in New Bedford, whereas in 1928 the annual dividends averaged from \$2.20 in New Bedford mills to \$2.40 in the Fall River mills. What is true of the mills located in the cities which I have mentioned is likewise true of the textile industry in the State whose people I have the honor to represent.

I do not wish to have it understood that I am desirous of balancing the books of our manufacturers in New England or in any other part of the country. I merely wish to show that the state of the industries to which I refer, so far as New England is concerned, is not prosperous and that necessarily those who are employed in those industries can not be covered.

As another indication of the need of careful consideration of legislation looking to bettering the conditions of this industry, I call attention to the percentage of working capacity employed in the cotton mills of New England, and I shall also include a schedule showing these percentages. They are based on a single

shift capacity of eight or nine hours a day. As an illustration of the existing depression, it appears from these figures which I have secured that the cotton mills of New England during the years 1922-23, operated on a basis of 86 per cent of their capacity, whereas in 1927-28 they operated on a basis of 70 per cent of their capacity.

Referring to a circular of the Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, showing the activity in the cotton-spinning industry for April, 1929, we find that the average spindle hours for that month in the United States were 251, whereas for the New England States they were 173.

Of course, I realize it may be urged that the depression in industry in New England, and particularly in cotton textiles, is not due wholly to competition from abroad, that it is due in some measure, and it is claimed in some quarters, in large measure, to changes in styles, to overproduction, and to the use of other fabrics. Nevertheless, we in New England do know that our manufacturers in the textile industry have suffered from ever-increasing importations from abroad, even since the passage of the tariff act of 1922. But whether or not we are justified in our claims, we do contend that it is a subject which should have the serious consideration of this Congress and of the Committee on Finance in the course of its present deliberations. We do know that the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, which has given much thought and consideration to this question, and has held numerous hearings upon it, stated in its report accompanying the proposed tariff act of 1929 that—

The principal item reported under the cotton schedule is cotton cloth, of which imports in 1928 were valued at \$15,360,465.

As a result of their consideration of this subject, they reported increases in duties on cotton yarns, countable cotton cloth, and other items of like nature. In the consideration of the textile industry as it relates to the production of wool fabrics, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives has provided an increased duty, based, as it says, on the estimated differences between costs of production here and in England.

The need of protection to our industries is not confined to textiles. It is felt in other lines, including manufactures of iron and steel, of which we have many and large concerns in our State. Some of these industries are, and for several years have been subject to competition from abroad which has necessitated the curtailment of production in some instances to as much as 50 per cent. In some cases where many hundreds of skilled workmen are employed, I think I am justified in saying that the curtailment has been even greater than 50 per cent. Surely instances like these are deserving of the earnest consideration of this Congress.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Rhode Island will suspend while the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate Resolution 19, relative to the proposed amendment of paragraph 2 of Rule XXXVIII.

MR. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator from Washington [Mr. Jones] is not in the Chamber at the moment, but I know the request I am going to make would meet with his approval. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

MR. WATSON. Mr. President, I desire to state in this connection that I have no intention of attempting to prevent a vote on the Borah resolution, voting, of course, on the Jones amendment first. I trust that debate will be so limited that we may have a vote on the resolution this afternoon. The reason why I say that is because there are a number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber who desire to leave the city to-night or to-morrow, and I think the vote being about equally divided between the two sides, they would like to be recorded before leaving. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I trust we will proceed as rapidly as possible to the vote.

I have no objection to the request of the Senator from Nebraska.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the unfinished business is temporarily laid aside and the Senate continues the consideration of Senate Resolution No. 19. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. HEBERT] is entitled to the floor.

MR. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from Rhode Island permit an inquiry before he proceeds?

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Rhode Island yield to the Senator from Utah?

MR. HEBERT. I yield.

MR. KING. I have listened with interest to what the Senator has said. I assume he is in favor of a general revision, and

particularly a revision upward, so far as it would affect the products of the New England States. If I am in error, I would be glad to be corrected in my interpretation of the Senator's position.

MR. HEBERT. I do not see how the Senator can arrive at that conclusion from what I have said. I am in favor of an investigation of all schedules which affect industry in the country. I have so stated in the course of my remarks.

MR. KING. That would mean, then, a revision of all schedules.

MR. HEBERT. That does not necessarily follow. I have said that I am in favor of an examination and investigation of all schedules.

MR. KING. The Senator has mentioned the wool and cotton schedules, iron and steel, and of course all relevant products, as well as agriculture. So I am somewhat at a loss to determine if there is anything in the whole category of American commodities affecting the welfare of the people that would not come within the broad scope of the generalization indulged in by the Senator.

MR. HEBERT. The Senator confuses what I have said on the subject, because I have not asked for a general revision. I have asked for a general investigation of all schedules affecting industry and of all schedules affecting agriculture as well.

MR. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

MR. HEBERT. Certainly.

MR. KING. If there is an investigation, there must be a purpose behind it. The purpose obviously is an increase of rates. Is not that true, and does not the Senator's argument lead to the position that we must have a general revision predicated, first, upon an investigation of all the schedules?

MR. HEBERT. That would not necessarily follow. It might be that many schedules would bear a reduction, whereas many schedules would justify an increase.

During the discussion of the measure for farm relief it was brought out here that we imported annually agricultural products of a value of some \$2,000,000,000 and that the farmers of our own country should be placed in position to provide these foodstuffs. As I recall it, the statement was made on this floor that we should so legislate that the American market should be made available to the American farmer. With this statement I am in hearty accord, but I maintain that it should be made to apply to industry as well as to agriculture. I have repeatedly said to the people of my State that I should favor legislation which would give to the American manufacturers the control of the American market. I still adhere to that proposition. I am not unwilling, however, to have it apply to agriculture; but, being willing that it shall so apply, I must insist that industries shall not be entirely overlooked.

The problems of agriculture and industry are so interwoven that, in my judgment, we can not do justice to the one if we fail to consider the other, for if we eliminate all investigation of industry in the consideration of the proposed tariff, we shall disarrange those delicate adjustments which make for prosperity in all lines of endeavor. For instance, if those engaged in the manufacture of cotton goods in New England are not to have steady employment because of depression in that industry, brought on in whatever measure by competition from abroad, then it will follow that the farmers of the country will cease to have a market for their products so far as New England is concerned. The same is true in other lines of endeavor in the industrial States, for, after all, the great markets for the farm's products of this country are to be found in the populous centers in the industrial States. The prosperity of the farmer, therefore, is dependent upon that of the industrial wage earner; and so, if we are to limit our consideration of tariff legislation to such schedules as affect agriculture alone, I believe that we should not only be doing an injustice to industry but, indeed, we shall be making what will amount to an idle gesture on behalf of agriculture.

I believe the subject of tariff legislation should be approached by this Congress in a spirit of cooperation. In no other way, in my judgment, can we legislate for the best interests of all concerned. For my own part, I promise that I shall give the most sincere consideration to the demands of agriculture, but I bespeak for the industries of my State, as well as for those of every other State, a like consideration.

THE VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the request of the Senator from Rhode Island to have certain tables printed in the RECORD in connection with his remarks will be granted.

The tables are as follows:

Dividends paid by the cotton industry in New Bedford and Fall River, Mass., since the passage of the last tariff act

Year	New Bedford		Fall River	
	Average dividends			
	Quarterly	Annual	Quarterly	Annual
1922 ¹	\$2.43	\$9.72	\$2.00	\$8.00
1923	1.74	6.96	2.06	8.24
1924	1.28	5.12	1.61	6.44
1925	1.32	5.28	.93	3.72
1926	1.02	4.08	.72	2.88
1927	.79	3.16	.73	2.92
1928	.55	2.20	.60	2.40

¹ Tariff act of that year did not go into effect until fall.

Percentage of working capacity employed in New England cotton mills during same period

(Percentages are based on a single-shift capacity of 8 or 9 hours a day)

Year	Percentage of capacity
1922-23	86
1923-24	64
1924-25	67
1925-26	69
1926-27	77
1927-28	70

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the main dispute on the passage of the resolution introduced by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] seems to be whether the President is for it or whether he is against it. Little has been said about the merits of the resolution, but most of the debate came about on the disagreement on the part of Senators as to whether President Hoover would like us to confine our tariff revision to farm products or whether we should have a general revision. As one of those anxious to find out what the President's idea is on this question it becomes necessary for me to weigh the arguments pro and con in order to reach a conclusion which will influence my vote.

Mr. President, from my analysis of the arguments thus far made I am bound to conclude that the resolution is an administration measure. First, it is introduced and sponsored by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], who more perhaps than any other one man was relied upon in the recent campaign to bring victory to the Hoover forces. It was he who secured from President Hoover in the middle of that national contest a promise that if he were elected he would call a special session of Congress. It was the Senator from Idaho who was relied upon to lead the fight from one end of the Nation to the other.

Secondly, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. BROOKHART], who I see honoring me with his presence, is in favor of the resolution. All through that contest throughout the great agricultural West it was the voice of the Iowa colonel resounding from every stump that brought to the support of President Hoover the vast vote of the farmers in that great community. On agricultural matters particularly he was quoted by the leaders of the Hoover campaign more than any other Senator, more than any other campaigner.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator allow me to call for a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SACKETT in the chair). Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Mississippi for that purpose?

Mr. NORRIS. No, Mr. President, I must decline to yield.

His words of wisdom—whether they were words of wisdom is somewhat doubtful now, but they were considered words of wisdom then—were heralded throughout the country as coming from the leader of agriculture, an expert on agriculture.

Then, thirdly, the resolution is enthusiastically supported by the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. ALLEN], who left his quiet and more remunerative occupation of journalism to come to the Senate for the sole and only purpose of putting on the statute books the wishes of President Hoover.

With this array of distinguished Senators in its favor and supporting it, it seems to me I am justified in reaching the conclusion that this is an administration resolution.

There is only one fly in the ointment. The great Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON], our leader on this side of the Chamber, seems to be against the resolution. But if that would bring doubt to one who wanted to carry out the President's wishes, he might get great justification for the conclusion that I have reached by looking over recent history. We travel so rapidly in this age that unless we record historical

announcements from day to day as they come up, we are apt to forget them, and because nobody else has undertaken to make a record of them, it seems that I had better undertake the unpleasant and difficult task.

Mr. President, have we forgotten the ideo of March? Have we forgotten that beautiful Sabbath Day on the 3d of March when, as we supposed at the time, presenting a united front and carrying out the wishes of our new leader who in a few hours was to be installed in the White House, we met in this Senate Chamber and fought the first battle on the question of the repeal of the national-origins clause?

It is true, Mr. President, that in the great campaign which had just preceded some Republican followers had gone astray and followed false gods, but on this occasion, like the prodigal son of old, in sackcloth and ashes, in humiliation and submission, they had quietly come back into the fold of the faithful. We supposed that on that occasion we were going to administer a knock-out blow to the national-origins clause; but, Mr. President, to our disappointment and dismay, we found when the battle was over that, instead of knocking out the national-origins clause and carrying out the wishes of Mr. Hoover, we ourselves were ignominiously knocked out, and after the roar of musketry and cannon had died away, and some of us had raised our bleeding and wounded bodies from the blood-stained ground, through the disappearing smoke and carnage of battle, when we looked across "no man's land," we saw our great leader, but, instead of following Hoover, we saw him, a new leader, who had just been installed in office here, triumphantly and pleasantly smoking the pipe of peace in the camp of the common enemy. [Laughter.]

Mr. President, to proceed with the recital of these historic events, just a few days ago we fought the second battle over the national-origins clause. Again united, as we supposed, we made a second effort to please the President of the United States and to carry out one of his recommendations by administering defeat to the national-origins clause; but when, on that occasion, the name of the great Senator from Indiana, our leader, was reached on the roll call, there was silence; there was no response. At a time when we needed his vote, when we needed his inspiring and cheering voice, when we needed his influence, when we needed his assistance, he was not there, although we had seen him just a few minutes before in his place in the Senate, and we saw him but a few moments after the vote was taken sitting in his accustomed seat, bearing the emblems of his official leadership and position.

So, Mr. President, I say we should not pay so much attention to the wishes of our senatorial leader. It may be that our senatorial leader, and our presidential leader alike, on those historical occasions are not in harmony. I think, therefore, I am justified in reaching the conclusion which I stated at the beginning of my remarks. Verily, verily, I say unto you, Mr. President, that the Senator from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will have to revise his list of pseudo-Republicans; he will have to place on that honored roll the great name of our distinguished leader, the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON].

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like very much to have a vote upon the pending resolution before long, and I intend now to take but a few moments of the time of the Senate. I can not see any good reason why the resolution should be adopted. I am quite sure that it is not in conformity with the declarations of the President before the late presidential campaign or after the campaign. I have before me now the first message of the President to Congress, and I want to read what he said upon that occasion:

In considering the tariff for other industries than agriculture, we find that there have been economic shifts necessitating a readjustment of some of the tariff schedules. Seven years of experience under the tariff bill enacted in 1922 have demonstrated the wisdom of Congress in the enactment of that measure. On the whole it has worked well. In the main our wages have been maintained at high levels; our exports and imports have steadily increased; with some exceptions our manufacturing industries have been prosperous. Nevertheless, economic changes have taken place during that time, which have placed certain domestic products at a disadvantage and new industries have come into being, all of which creates the necessity for some limited changes in the schedules and in the administrative clauses of the laws as written in 1922.

No discrimination against any foreign industry is involved in equalizing the difference in costs of production at home and abroad and thus taking from foreign producers the advantages they derive from paying lower wages to labor. Indeed, such equalization is not only a measure of social justice at home, but by the lift it gives to our standards of living we increase the demand for those goods from abroad that we do

not ourselves produce. In a large sense we have learned that the cheapening of the toiler decreases rather than promotes permanent prosperity because it reduces the consuming power of the people.

Mr. President, I shall not read further. That statement, as I have stated, was made in the first message of President Hoover to the Congress of the United States. The House of Representatives has acted in accordance with the message as to the revision of the tariff. There is no Senator present but will admit that there are inequalities in the existing tariff law affecting other industries than the industry of agriculture. I wish to say that the House of Representatives recognized that and has made the following changes—

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Am I to understand that the Senator from Utah approves the House bill?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not say that, but I had reference to the changes made by the House bill in the schedules other than that relating to agricultural products. There are some rates in the House bill of which I do not approve. I wish, however, to call the attention of the Senate to the changes the House has made in the various tariff schedules, so that Senators may see that the House had one idea above all others, namely, that the agriculture should be afforded relief, for the changes in the agricultural schedule made by the House of Representatives equal within 2 the changes made in the other 13 schedules of the bill.

Mr. BORAH. Is the Senator from Utah speaking of the number of changes?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I will also come to the increases made in the duties and call the attention of the Senate to the very few decreases which were made, so that Senators may see what increases in the agricultural schedule have been made, and also the increases made in the other schedules as well.

In the chemical schedule there are 93 paragraphs, there are 215 basic articles, and the tariff increases proposed by the House are 20. In the earthenware schedule there are 37 paragraphs; there are 55 basic articles, and the rates on 14 of them are increased by the bill of the House of Representatives. The metals schedule has 101 paragraphs; there are 250 basic articles and there were only 14 increases made. In the manufactures of wood schedule there are 30 basic articles, and the House increased the duty in 3 instances. In the tobacco schedule there are 4 paragraphs, 3 basic articles, and the House has changed 2. In the agricultural schedule there are 80 paragraphs; there are 150 basic articles, and the House has increased the duty in the case of 115. In the spirits and wines schedule there are 9 paragraphs, with 12 basic articles, and the House has changed 2. In the cotton schedule there are 20 paragraphs; there are 25 basic articles and the House has changed 30.

I ask, Mr. President, that the entire list of these schedules, with the action of the House thereon, may be printed in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Schedule	Paragraphs	Basic articles	Tariff increases proposed
1. Chemicals.....	93	215	20
2. Earthenware.....	37	55	14
3. Metals, etc.....	101	250	14
4. Wood, etc.....	9	30	3
5. Sugar, etc.....	4	6	3
6. Tobacco.....	4	3	2
7. Agriculture, etc.....	80	150	115
8. Spirits and wines.....	9	12	2
9. Cotton, etc.....	20	25	30
10. Flax, etc.....	22	31	13
11. Wool, etc.....	19	18	8
12. Silk, etc.....	12	20	7
13. Rayon (a new schedule).....			
14. Papers and books.....	13	60	6
15. Sundries.....	59	250	15

Outside of Schedule 1 (chemicals) the total increases in rates in the House bill were 117, not including agriculture.

The total rate increases in agriculture were only two less than the total rate increases in all other 13 schedules in the bill.

Not including chemicals and agriculture—total increases..... 117
Total increases in rates in agriculture alone..... 115

This indicates that the House bill, after all, favors agriculture as much as all industrial schedules outside of chemicals.

Mr. SMOOT. There are 115 increases in the House bill in the agricultural schedule, while other increases number but 117;

in other words, in the other 13 schedules of the House bill but 117 changes have been made, while in the agricultural schedule 115 have been made.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, will the Senator from Utah yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. SMOOT. I yield.

Mr. REED. Does the Senator from Utah think that those contrasting figures give a complete picture of the situation? It occurs to me that agriculture has been treated even better than those figures would indicate. We have found in the work we have done so far on the chemical schedule that many chemicals which I would never associate with agriculture at all are made out of low-grade agricultural products that would not otherwise be sold, and that the benefit in that case goes directly to agriculture, in keeping the manufacture of such chemicals in this country. Butyl acetate is one of them. I never heard of it before. It goes into photographic films. That does not sound like an agricultural product, but it uses 8,000,000 bushels of domestic low-grade corn. There is a change which has been made directly for the benefit of agriculture.

Mr. SMOOT. I will also say that of the principal agricultural organizations of the country interested in certain oils and fats without a single exception desire an increase in the rates on those items.

Mr. REED. Of course, all of them do. Casein affords another illustration, and yet the Senator includes those among his 117 changes in the other parts of the bill. It seems to me that the proportion is much greater in favor of the agricultural items.

Mr. SMOOT. I simply wanted to make a statement to the Senator of the actual changes under the schedules; and I have already done that. If the Senator wants to know what are the increases in the House bill on agricultural products, I have taken particular pains to go over most of them. They are as follows:
Cattle, from 1½ to 2 and 2 to 2½ cents a pound.

Fresh beef and veal, from 3 cents to 6 cents a pound—100 per cent.

Sheep, from \$2 to \$3—an increase of 50 per cent.

Mutton and goat meats, from 2½ to 5 cents a pound—an increase of 100 per cent.

Lamb, from 4 to 7 cents a pound.

Swine, from one-half cent a pound to 2 cents a pound.

Pork, from three-fourths of a cent a pound to 2½ cents a pound.

Bacon and hams, from 2 cents a pound to 3¼ cents a pound.

Lard, from 1 to 3 cents a pound.

Lard compounds, from 4 to 5 cents a pound.

Reindeer meat and venison, from 4 to 6 cents a pound.

Milk, fresh or sour, from 2½ cents to 5 cents.

Buttermilk, from 1 cent to 5 cents.

Cream, from 20 cents to 48 cents a gallon.

Butter, from 8 to 14 cents. Substitutes are raised to the same rate.

Cheese, from 5 to 7 cents.

Poultry, from 3 to 6 cents.

Dressed birds and poultry, from 6 to 8 cents; turkeys, to 10 cents.

Eggs, per dozen, 8 to 10 cents.

Buckwheat, from 10 cents per hundred to 25 cents per hundred.

Corn, from 15 cents per bushel of 56 pounds to 25 cents per bushel.

Rough rice, from 1 cent to 1¼ cents; hulled rice, from 1¼ cents to 1½ cents.

Apricots, from 1 to 2 cents.

Citrons or citron peel, candied, from 4½ cents to 8 cents.

Figs, from 2 cents to 5 cents.

Limes, from 1 cent to 2 cents.

Grapefruit, from 1 cent to 1½ cents.

Pineapples, from 22½ cents a crate to 35 cents a crate.

Peanuts, not shelled, from 3 cents to 4¼ cents; shelled, from 4 cents to 7 cents.

Edible nuts, shelled, from 1 cent to 10 cents; unshelled, from 1 cent to 5 cents.

Soy beans, from one-half of 1 cent to 2 cents.

Beans, cowpeas, green or unripe, from 1 cent to 3½ cents; dried, from 1¾ cents to 2½ cents.

Peas, green or unripe, from 1 to 2 cents; dried, from 1 to 1¾ cents; split, from 1 cent to 1¼ cents.

Onions, from 1½ cents to 2 cents.

Irish potatoes, from 50 to 75 cents per hundred pounds.

Tomatoes in natural state, from one-half of 1 cent to 3 cents.

Rice straw, from \$1 per ton to \$10 per ton.

I desire to say that the rest of the schedule is about in the same proportion, although these are the principal items on which the House has acted.

Now, I want to refer to the treatment that the farmers of this country got under the last Democratic tariff bill, and show the Senate just what changes were made in that bill.

For instance, beef and veal, fresh, were on the free list.

Cattle were on the free list.

Tallow was on the free list.

Oleo steatin was on the free list.

Goats were on the free list.

Lamb, fresh, was on the free list.

Mutton was on the free list.

Sheep were on the free list.

Bacon and hams were on the free list.

Lard was on the free list.

Lard compounds and substitutes were on the free list.

Pork, fresh, was on the free list.

Pork, prepared, was on the free list.

Swine were on the free list.

Meats not otherwise specifically provided for were on the free list.

Cream was on the free list.

Milk, fresh, was on the free list.

Milk, condensed or prepared, was on the free list.

Eggs in shell were on the free list.

Birds, live, except poultry, were on the free list.

Buckwheat flour was on the free list.

Buckwheat, hulled and unhulled, was on the free list.

Corn was on the free list.

Rye was on the free list.

Wheat was on the free list.

Flour was on the free list.

Potatoes were on the free list.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORBECK. I just want to suggest that it does not make any difference to the wheat producer of this country, as I see it, whether wheat is on the free list or not.

Mr. SMOOT. That will lead to quite a discussion, Mr. President. I am quite sure that the farmers of the country do not want wheat to go on the free list. I am sure of that, whether the Senator thinks there is no advantage coming from it or not.

It does seem to me, Mr. President, that there is no necessity for having this resolution pass the Senate. The bill is before the committee. The committee has divided up into subcommittees. Everybody is going to have a chance to be heard. It will take us perhaps until about July 10 to finish the hearings. The country will be satisfied, at least so far as the hearings and the action of the Senate are concerned, if the representatives not only of the farmers but of the industries of the country have a chance to come and tell their story to the committee; and it will not take very much longer, I think, than if we undertook now to consider only agricultural products and directly related schedules. In fact, I do not know just how we could decide that question. What is a directly related schedule? You could say "a related product," and of course that we could not possibly do in a tariff schedule; but if you say "a related schedule," a schedule means the whole schedule. No matter whether there is one item in it or many items, that schedule, then, is to be considered; and it does seem to me that it would not hasten the consideration of the bill and the passage of a law if we undertook to pass this resolution.

I know that a tariff bill ought to be passed which will do everything that a tariff bill can do to advance the interests of the farmers of this country. There is no one in the Senate, there is no one in the country, in my opinion, who has not the same feeling and the same idea; and I know that the Finance Committee of the Senate as now organized will give every industry a chance to be heard. Whether or not any changes will be made is for the full committee to decide; but I know that demands are being made which in many cases I consider unreasonable demands, and I know that the Finance Committee can not and will not comply with them. Wherever there is a real necessity, however, wherever an industry shows beyond a question of a doubt that there is a real necessity for an increase, I am sure the Finance Committee will give consideration to that demand.

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I yield to the Senator.

Mr. FESS. The Senator has mentioned 117 changes in schedules other than the agricultural schedules. I should like to ask the Senator a question in regard to parliamentary procedure. Suppose the resolution now under consideration passes. Would that be an instruction to the representatives of the Senate, when they get into conference, not to consider anything that is not agricultural or immediately related to agriculture?

Mr. SMOOT. As chairman of the committee, I should take the passage of this resolution as an instruction to that effect.

Mr. FESS. What is the effect on a conference if, before the conference is had, there are instructions to the conferees, What would be the attitude of the other House?

Mr. SMOOT. I think the result would be that the bill would go into conference, and if the House did not yield we would come back to the Senate and ask for instructions; or, if we did yield to the increases made in the House bill outside of the agricultural schedules—and some of them I do not want to yield to—of course, they would be in conference.

Mr. FESS. My only concern was this: The House bill would be in conference with all of those items; but if the Senate had instructed its conferees not to consider those items, what would be the attitude of the House in the conference?

Mr. SMOOT. I say, I think before any action could be taken by the conferees on the part of the Senate they would have to have instructions from the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMOOT. I do.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that this resolution does not relate to the matter which the Senator is discussing.

Mr. FESS. I will state that I had noted that—that it relates only to the action of the committee.

Mr. BORAH. Yes.

Mr. FESS. But, if the Senator will permit me, I should like to have the opinion of the Senator from Idaho as to whether instructions to the committee would not be tantamount to instructions to the Senate?

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think so.

Mr. FESS. Of course, that makes some difference.

Mr. SMOOT. Then the Senator takes the position that we are simply to consider the agricultural schedules and those directly related thereto, and leave all the other amendments of the House unacted upon by the committee, and report the bill to the Senate, and then have the Senate pass upon them without even having hearings upon them. That would be the effect of it.

Are we at the present time in a position to answer the questions that would have to be answered? I think we ought to have the fullest investigation of every item in this bill that is to be considered on the floor, and that the committee members ought to be in a position to answer any questions that may be asked by any Member of this body. If there is an increase, why should the increase take place? If there is a decrease, why should there be a decrease? If there is a transfer from the free list to the dutiable list, why was the transfer made? And the same thing if there is a transfer from the dutiable list to the free list. I can not see how that can be done if we are to close the doors now and have no hearings whatever upon those items.

Mr. President, in conclusion I will simply say that I can not see any good to come from the resolution, but I can see a great deal of injustice to come from it as far as the Finance Committee is concerned.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator a question. I assume that the Senator from Utah will be one of the conferees on the tariff bill.

Mr. SMOOT. More than likely.

Mr. JONES. If the committee is not permitted to hold its hearings and go into these House items, I am wondering what position our conferees would be in with reference to those items in conference with the House committee. In other words, would you be in a position to controvert properly with them over their items?

Mr. SMOOT. We would be at a great disadvantage.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah has analyzed the House bill. I desire to put into the Record a discussion of the House bill by the leading agricultural organizations of the country, together with a telegram from the Minneapolis Tribune and a number of other telegrams from farm organizations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

TARIFF BILL DOES NOT GIVE ADEQUATE PROTECTION TO AGRICULTURE

The proposed tariff act of 1929 (H. R. 2667) allows some increases of duties on commodities that come in competition with products of farms in the United States, but the bill generally does not satisfy farmers because it does not provide adequate duties on major products of the farm, according to the conclusions reached by representatives of 12 farm organizations after consideration of the bill.

The position of the farm organizations is explained in a statement sent to Members of the Senate and House of Representatives and signed by representatives of the following organizations: National Grange American Farm Bureau Federation, National Cooperative Milk Producers, American Dairy Federation, National Producers, Dairy Union, American Cotton Growers' Exchange, American National Livestock Association, National Livestock Producers' Association, American Fish Oil Association, Texas and Oklahoma Cotton Seed Crushers' Association, Southern Tariff Association, and the tariff committee of the National Poultry Council.

The full statement sent to Members of the Senate and the House of Representatives follows:

"Representatives of the farm groups and allied organizations whose names are attached to this communication have come to a unanimous conclusion regarding the treatment accorded agriculture in the proposed tariff act of 1929 (H. R. 2667).

"Because of the far-reaching effect of this tariff legislation, we have concluded that an obligation rests upon the organizations we represent to make known to you and to the public our views as to the extent to which the treatment accorded agriculture approaches fulfillment of the Republican Party's platform pledge.

"1. The bill allows some increases of duties on commodities that come into competition with products of farms of the United States. Those increases will be beneficial to the agricultural producers. But the bill generally will not satisfy farmers because it does not provide adequate duties on major products of the farm.

"2. The Republican Party at its last convention included in its declarations as to tariff the following pledge:

"A protective tariff is as vital to American agriculture as it is to American manufacturing. The Republican Party believes that the home market, built up under the protective policy, belongs to the American farmer, and it pledges its support of legislation which will give this market to him to the full extent of his ability to supply it."

MEASURE SAID TO FAIL TO FULFILL PLEDGE

"Our examination of the proposed duties in the light of this definite pledge that the domestic market is to be reserved for agricultural producers of this country convinces us that the bill in important instances has fallen far short of meeting the responsibility of carrying out this pledge to agriculture.

"3. The bill also denies to the agricultural producers of the United States any measure of protection against products imported from the Philippine Islands. This denial was made in the face of the legal right to impose such duties, although the principle is admitted and declared in the bill. The continued granting of such privileges to residents of the Philippine Islands at the expense of our agriculture constitutes one of the most important obstacles to our agriculture becoming normal and regaining its rightful share of the national income.

"4. The bill also fails to recognize a very serious problem which has become a real concern to our producers during the past decade. This problem has to do with the principle of levying import duties upon products which, although different, can be substituted for commodities produced in this country. The effect of competition through substitution is just as important to us as the effect of direct competition commodity by commodity.

"With regard to the neglect in the bill of this principle, we call attention to the long list in the schedules covering oils and fats and the raw materials from which such oils and fats are extracted, nearly all of which are interchangeable in whole or in part. This principle of substitution is also found operative with respect to other commodities.

DANGEROUS PRINCIPLE INVOLVED

"5. We are also alarmed by the fact that a very dangerous principle was extended in its application when, in addition to olive oil, palm-kernel oil, which was transferred from the free list to the dutiable list, was allowed to come into the country free of duty when rendered unfit for edible purposes. This proviso may be considered as the entering wedge of the industrial users to get the principle made generally applicable to a large range of oils and fats in case at any time they should lose their fight to keep such commodities on a low scale of duties or on the free list.

"6. We are herewith itemizing some of the important commodities imported into this country which should have higher rates than are provided for in the bill as reported:

"The oils and fats and their oil-bearing raw materials as found in paragraphs 53, 54, 55, 57, 58, 701, 703, 760, 1728, 1732, 1734, 1794;

dairy products as found in paragraphs 19, 707, 708, 709, 710; hides, paragraph 1693; live cattle, 701; long-staple cotton, paragraph 1662; tapioca and sago starch, paragraphs 1755, 1781; dried eggs, paragraph 713; berries, paragraph 736; cherries, paragraph 737; figs, paragraph 740; dates, paragraph 741; peaches, paragraph 745; beans, paragraph 763; mushrooms, paragraph 766; peas, paragraph 767; onions, paragraph 768; potatoes, paragraph 769; tomato paste and canned tomatoes, paragraph 770.

"The above list is by no means complete, and other items may be justifiably added to it as result of later consideration by ourselves and others.

"We also ask that title 3, section 301, of the bill be so changed as to make dutiable agricultural products of the Philippines imported into this country, with the understanding that the revenues thus derived shall be segregated and turned into the treasury of the Philippine government.

"7. The Democratic platform also made promises of tariff increases to agriculture. That platform stated:

"It is a fundamental principle of the party that such tariffs as are levied must not discriminate against any industry, class, or section. Therefore, we pledge that in its tariff policy the Democratic Party will insist upon equality of treatment between agriculture and other industries."

"In view of this pledge of the Democratic Party, and in view of the manifest failure of the new tariff bill to keep the Republican Party pledge, we now rely upon the friends of agriculture of both parties of the House and the Senate to use every effort to correct these manifest injustices."

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 16, 1929.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,

Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.:

On behalf of the agricultural interests of Minnesota and North and South Dakota, we congratulate you upon your resolution demanding that the Republican Party's pledges to agriculture be fulfilled. We want you to know that the Northwest is behind you in this fine fight you are waging on behalf of the farmer.

It is the opinion of the Northwest that many of the increases secured by industry in the Hawley bill not only fail to square with the Republican Party's promises but in a large measure nullify the advantages won by agriculture in the purely agricultural increases.

The great number of increases secured by industry has shocked the Northwest and given rise to the impression that, unless drastic action is taken by the Senate, the Hawley tariff bill will widen rather than narrow the spread between industry and agriculture.

Recently the Tribune forwarded to Senator Smoot a telegram of protest against the Hawley bill. This protest was signed by 220 organizations in the four Northwestern States representing over 300,000 citizens. Inasmuch as your resolution will come up in the Senate Monday, time does not permit getting the signatures of the representative organizations to you before the resolution comes to a vote. The Tribune is certain that those organizations that signed the telegram of protest addressed to Senator Smoot will gladly sign this telegram indorsing your resolution.

The Tribune is asking these organizations to sign this message and will wire their signatures to you as soon as possible.

THE MINNEAPOLIS TRIBUNE.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 17, 1929.

Senator W. E. BORAH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

About 1,000 farm people assembled at Pinelake voiced unanimous approval of your resolution limiting tariff consideration to farm products and schedules of articles affecting market of farm products. These farmers are members of Minnesota Farm Bureau and the large Pine County Holstein Breeders Association.

JOHN B. IRWIN,

President Minnesota Holstein Association.

HICKLEY, MINN., June 16, 1929.

Senator BORAH,

Congress of United States, Washington, D. C.:

Pine County Farm Bureau, with a membership of over 600 farmers, strongly favor the resolution introduced by yourself and sincerely hope that it will be adopted. Raising tariff on farm produce and then increasing tariff on what he has to buy will not help. Your resolution should be adopted.

A. P. JENSEN, President.

ASKOV A. W. SOMMERS, Secretary.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 15, 1929.

Senator W. E. BORAH,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Minnesota Holstein Association of more than 1,600 breeders appreciate your resolution restricting consideration to tariff affecting the

market of United States farm products. This gives the Republican Senate and House a chance to keep faith with the farmers and support the election pledges of the President.

JOHN D. IRWIN, *President.*

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 15, 1929.

Senator WILLIAM E. BORAH,
Washington, D. C.:

We are 100 per cent back of you in your stand on agricultural tariff's special session called for consideration of agricultural problems and what agriculture has received so far only excuse for boosting industrial rates. Congress should either act in accordance with campaign pledges or adjourn and go home. We admire your courage in taking stands you do.

LAND O' LAKES CREAMERIES (INC.).

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I have a great many telegrams, among them a great many telegrams from labor organizations, opposing this resolution most strenuously, and giving the reasons for their opposition. Perhaps other Senators have received the same telegrams. I do not know.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, apropos of the statement just made by my colleague, I wish the Senate to know that for perhaps more than a year Matthew Woll, a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, pretending, I think, to speak for the American Federation of Labor—but many strong labor men denounced his position—has advocated, and advocated before our committee, a repeal of the Sherman law, and of the Clayton Act, and of all antitrust legislation, so as to permit monopolies not only in manufactured products but in all products, so far as the monopoly might be interdicted or prohibited by the antitrust laws, so that if Matthew Woll speaks for labor, I have no hesitancy in saying that Matthew Woll, and labor, so far as he speaks for it, are in a combination, not a very honorable one, with the monopolists of the United States who are trying to fasten upon the American people a system of exploitation that will be injurious to the consumer.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at the Thirty-seventh Annual Convention of the American Federation of Labor, held in Buffalo, N. Y., that organization considered certain resolutions, and I suppose the Senator knows what those resolutions are. I am quite sure that the labor organizations of the country, if the resolutions which have been made public reflect their real sentiments—I do not know whether they passed them or not, but they have been printed—are in favor of a tariff law carrying duties sufficient to equalize the cost of production of goods in the United States and the cost of production of similar goods in foreign countries.

Mr. President, I just want to say one other word, though not in connection with this matter, because I think it is perhaps worthy of consideration by the Senate. After reading the thousands upon thousands of letters that come to the Finance Committee, hundreds and hundreds of letters on every subject, I have come to this conclusion as to the conditions existing in America: The result of the mass production that has been inaugurated in the United States has been the cheapening of goods manufactured in the United States to those concerns involved. The result has been that the smaller manufacturer, who now carries on his business as he did in years past, is the class now knocking at the door for assistance. We do not see appearing before the committee the representatives of the concerns producing by mass production in the United States. It is the smaller manufacturer, the man who employs 100 or 200 men.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, are the manufacturers of cement included?

Mr. SMOOT. The manufacturers of cement?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. Does the Senator refer to those as small manufacturers?

Mr. SMOOT. No, Mr. President; I did not refer to everyone who appeared, but I will say that the great mass of the witnesses who come before the Finance Committee represent that class of manufacturers.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. How about the producers of steel?

Mr. SMOOT. I have no letter from the producers of steel. I have not a single, solitary letter from them. I have some from the small tool manufacturers in Ohio and some of the smaller concerns that are manufacturing in a small way, but I have not a single, solitary letter from nor have I been approached by United States Steel representatives.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The bill as it passed the House does deal with those schedules.

Mr. SMOOT. That is what I say; it does deal with them, and I think we ought to deal with them. If the Borah resolution shall be passed, we can not deal with them, but we shall have exactly the same rates as are provided by the House, and they must be voted upon in this body with no hearings whatever.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, the net result of the passage of the so-called Borah resolution without such amendment as is suggested by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES], or an amendment bringing about the same result, would be simply a transfer of argument and debate, without inquiry and investigation, from the Finance Committee to the floor of the Senate.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. Why would it not be practicable and possible for the Finance Committee to go forward on the agricultural schedules, and report upon them? It does not make any difference what report the Committee on Finance might make, there will be amendments offered from the floor upon all schedules, perhaps, which the committee has not covered, or upon which they have not made a satisfactory report.

Mr. EDGE. Exactly; but if the Finance Committee were denied the opportunity of hearing witnesses now appearing, under oath, in the regular and usual manner, the Senate would be denied the opportunity of having the facts when the numerous amendments, so well prophesied by the Senator from Idaho, will be offered from the floor of the Senate. I am informed—and I have privately discussed the subject with one Senator who is, I think, third from the oldest Senator in the body in point of service—that this is the first time that an effort has been made to instruct a standing committee of the Senate as to the course it should follow in considering a measure referred to it in the ordinary way. Of course, the Senate has gone on record time after time, in resolutions, expressing their viewpoint as to policies on many subjects, but I repeat that in considering a measure, either introduced in the Senate or having been passed by the other House and received in the usual way by the Senate, and then referred to the committee, so far as I have been able to ascertain, this is the first effort that has ever been made to direct a standing committee as to how it should proceed in its inquiry in order to obtain the facts to present to the Senate for further consideration.

I do not propose to take the time of the Senate to discuss at all the merits or the alleged merits or demerits of the schedules covering industry and those covering agriculture. I deplore all the apparent effort to divide those two great responsibilities. We are here exercising our best judgment for the common good of the common country, and, as has been frequently stated, one class of industry, whether on the farm or in the factory, can not reach anywhere near a maximum of prosperity without the other class of industry being also successful.

Right along that line, I have agreed many times that, although the cause of it is sometimes hard to analyze and define, there is a great depression in the farming industry, and I am prepared, as a member of the Finance Committee, and have been as a Member of the Senate for 10 or 11 years, to review and consider any matter in the interest of agriculture, and to go the absolute limit, in what has appealed to me as being wise, in endeavoring to help the farmers in any direction in which they have sought help from the Congress.

When we are just commencing an investigation of tariff conditions, that technicalities should be resorted to, or an inquiry as to whether the word "next" means a special session or a regular session, seems to me entirely outside of the purview of the responsibility which everyone of us should assume.

The fact remains that we are considering the fundamental revision of the tariff, and when we consider the fundamental revision of the tariff, be it agriculture or be it industry, I can not conceive any possible justification for refusing even to listen to a representative of any class of industry, or of any class of agriculture, which desires, through its representatives, to appeal to the Congress or to the committee of the Congress having under consideration such a measure.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the statement just made by the Senator, particularly when he said when we are considering the fundamentals of the tariff, imply that there shall be a comprehensive and sweeping investigation and consideration of the entire tariff question—

Mr. EDGE. Investigation; yes.

Mr. KING. And that means, of course, a revision upward or a revision downward, or a maintenance of the status quo, dependent upon whether the cupidity of those who appear before us makes sufficient appeal to the consciences of the Senators.

Mr. EDGE. In view of the fact, for the first time, to the best of my knowledge, all witnesses appearing before the subcommittees of the Finance Committee are now presenting their statements under oath; in the future that evidence will, under our recognized laws, occupy a somewhat different position from what has been termed *ex parte* evidence or testimony which may have been heretofore submitted by witnesses not under oath.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. Has the Senator found, before the subcommittee of which he is a member, the same condition to exist that has occurred before the subcommittee of which I am a member, namely, that about one-half of the witnesses who desire to appear are appearing in behalf of a reduction of schedules?

Mr. EDGE. I am very glad the Senator reminded me of that, or I might have forgotten it; I intended to refer to it. I will say that up to 12 o'clock to-day a decided majority of the witnesses who have appeared before the subcommittee considering the oil and chemical schedules—and, of course, I am only stating this from memory—have applied for reductions in existing duties, and I might say, further—and I have a memorandum of this on my desk—the second witness appearing before the committee considering the chemical schedule, when we first opened the hearings last Friday convinced me, unless evidence to the contrary can change my viewpoint, that an article for which he was appealing for a transfer from the basket clause, carrying 25 per cent *ad valorem*, to the free list, should be so transferred. So that there may not be any generalities in the presentation; may I state that plea referred to the importation of containers containing a certain type of gas which is used in a patented article, and which, under the sworn testimony of the witness, can not be produced satisfactorily in this country. I repeat I was convinced the 25 per cent *ad valorem* should come off. That is one little incident in connection with the second witness appearing before the committee on the chemical schedule in answer to the question of the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator will state—I am sure he will as soon as his attention is called to the matter—that substantially every person who has asked for a reduction has been an importer, and those are the only ones, may I say, so far as I now recall, who have sought to prevent an increased price of products to the consumer.

Mr. EDGE. Of course, Mr. President, we all admit that in the make-up of any tariff bill in the past—and the same will be true in the future—so far as witnesses are concerned, to a great extent the witnesses are moved by their own more or less selfish viewpoint. That we can not avoid. But I repeat, we can get the facts, whether an importer is seeking a lower tariff or an American producer is seeking proper protection. It is the duty of the Finance Committee to secure the information and to transmit it for the consideration of the Senate.

We are faced with this situation, as I view it. I referred to it briefly at the outset. We recognize the House—certainly there can not be any question under the Constitution about it—as that part of the Congress which must initiate tariff legislation. They have passed a tariff bill. It has completed one-half of its legislative journey. It is now before the Senate Finance Committee. Through no resolution of the Senate can we ignore that bill. That bill in due time, whatever resolution is passed by the Senate, will be reported by the Finance Committee to the Senate for consideration. If we are confined to a consideration of the agricultural schedules our report will contain such decisions as we arrive at regarding those schedules, but the House bill will, of course, come before the Senate intact in its relation to other schedules. What is then going to happen?

Various suggestions have been made this morning about the element of time. How can time be saved by this suggested procedure? What will happen naturally will be that representatives of various sections of the country, feeling all the more positive that the interests of their constituents have not been given proper consideration or rather ignored, will introduce amendments and endeavor to secure what they feel their industries deserve. The Senate then will face the problem of attempting to decide intelligently whether increases or reductions proposed by amendments are justified or otherwise. We will not save one minute of time. On the contrary, as a matter of common-sense analysis, we will add to the time, because in

the debates we will not have the benefit of sworn testimony, sworn investigation, sworn advice that would enable the proponents of this or that proposal to argue with the facts at hand. I can not see any object to be gained by the passage of the resolution, except a loss of time; and certainly that provides no help for the farmer. The resolution means a bill will be passed by the conference committee, and we might as well face it; and without any real, businesslike opportunity having been given to review the schedules passed by the House, with unsatisfactory results that any other Senator can prophesy just as well as I can.

Referring to the suggestion so frequently made by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] this morning, I can not see why the special session, under any interpretation either of the President's message or speeches, or of the oftentimes repeated plank of the Republican platform, in considering a tariff measure, should confine itself to any one particular class of industry or activity. Nothing the Senator from Idaho has said has convinced me his proposal would be in the interest of agriculture itself if those who claim to represent agriculture really want a tariff bill enacted into law.

Mr. BORAH. Then what does the Senator understand the President to mean when he used the expression "limited revision"?

Mr. EDGE. I did not intend to take the time to discuss that, but if the Senator desires me to do so I will. I do not want to be misunderstood. What the President said has been read I think several times this morning and at other times.

Mr. BORAH. What did he mean by "limited revision"?

Mr. EDGE. He meant exactly what he said. I have not any doubt about it and I will read what he said.

Mr. BORAH. I know what he said, but I want to know what he meant. The Senator said my proposition tends to limit the consideration of the committee to certain schedules. The President declared for limited revision. What did the President mean by "limited revision"?

Mr. EDGE. I am entirely in agreement with the President on the meaning of the words "limited revision."

Mr. BORAH. What did the President mean?

Mr. EDGE. I will try to advise the Senator what I am sure he means, and if that coincides with the President's views I shall be very happy because I am always very happy to be in agreement with him.

"Limited revision" means, according to my view, a revision of those schedules that have been adversely affected through economic conditions through a period of seven years, the most disturbed period following the most destructive war of history. "Limited revision" means a revision upward or downward of agriculture or industry or any activity that has been affected during that time adversely. That is my definition of limited revision.

Mr. BORAH. That definition is limited revision with no limit. That would include an investigation of all schedules.

Mr. EDGE. Absolutely. I think there should be an investigation of all commodities, so that representatives desiring to present their viewpoint or their situation may do so, but I still retain the word "revision" then as entirely a matter for the committee to decide. So far as I am concerned, I would be entirely satisfied by the sworn evidence adduced by the committee.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator has stated a rule which I presume would be the rule which the committee would follow under all circumstances.

Mr. EDGE. I assume so. I think they should.

Mr. BORAH. Then the President's term "limited revision" really has no significance at all, because under the Senator's proposition he would go ahead and examine all industries, all schedules, all commodities, and wherever he felt there was need of protection he would give it.

Mr. EDGE. If they applied to the committee and presented their case, that is the only way I can see that we can find out whether they come under what I presume is the Senator's analysis of the President's statement—whether they have suffered unemployment, whether anything has happened in the last few years to place them in a position that they should receive some help and consideration from their Congress. That is "limited." I assume many of them will not be able to make a case even if they should appear.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator would not give protection where it was not needed, would he?

Mr. EDGE. I tried to make that clear.

Mr. BORAH. And would give it where it is needed?

Mr. EDGE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. That would be true under any revision. That would be true in the making of any tariff bill, would it not?

Mr. EDGE. Yes.

Mr. BORAH. Then, the word "limited" really has no significance whatever, because the Senator would follow exactly the same rule and the same procedure and the result would be precisely the same as if the word "limited" had not been used at all.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator tries to make a distinction which, in my judgment, is not justified by the interpretation which every one of us have attempted to apply to the President's message. It would seem to me that the test of necessity for revision is to consider whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry. How can the Finance Committee provide a yardstick from President Hoover's message convening this Congress without permitting the representatives of any industry that desires to try to demonstrate the necessity for a revision coming before the committee?

Mr. BORAH. Let me ask the Senator a question.

Mr. EDGE. I have asked the Senator from Idaho a question.

Mr. BORAH. I am asking this question to illustrate my position. Suppose the President had said nothing about limited revision or undertaken to establish a yardstick, but had simply said there should be a revision of the tariff. What different procedure would the Senator follow under those circumstances than that which he claims the right to follow now?

Mr. EDGE. Fundamentally none. I would listen to the American citizen who cared to come before the committee when we were considering a general tariff bill which the House had already passed.

Mr. BORAH. Then, we have arrived at the point where the term "limited revision" has been eliminated. The Senator is going forward precisely the same as if the word "limited" had not been used by the President.

Mr. EDGE. No; the Senator can not assert that position for me. I made it perfectly clear, I think, and will reiterate it that it must be demonstrated to me that the industry needs help. If it is demonstrated that an industry does need help that can be secured through a revision of the tariff, then so far as I am concerned I believe it is my duty to try to secure it for them.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator would pursue that course with any bill he was undertaking to write involving the tariff, would he not?

Mr. EDGE. Yes; and I think the proposition presented by the President is very clear.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect does it change the Senator's attitude as to what commodity or what schedule should be considered?

Mr. EDGE. I have said many times it does not do so so far as hearing those appearing before the committee were concerned.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator would do that if there was no word "limited" used?

Mr. EDGE. Yes; except we have a rather definite yardstick of unemployment, general disruption through conditions throughout these unusual economic periods, and I am quite sure I would be a little more insistent under this formula than I would in dealing with a general revision.

Mr. BORAH. I think the word "limited" has evaporated.

Mr. EDGE. I would like to ask the Senator a question while we are in colloquy. The Senator said on June 10 in debate with certain other Senators:

I think if we could have a tariff based upon that principle it would be a just tariff; but I do not think the present tariff is based upon that principle.

This referred to the difference between cost of production at home and abroad. I will not take the time to read the preceding argument.

Then later on in the same discussion the Senator said further:

I have no desire to change the principle as between the manufacturer and the farmer. I am perfectly willing to apply the same principle to both. What I am asking for and what we are asking for is the application of the principle to the farmer the same as to industry.

I would like to ask the Senator from Idaho, with tariff revision under consideration, always recalling that the House has revised many industrial schedules that must be or will be considered by the Senate in one form or another, either by the committee in an orderly way or on the floor of the Senate in a disorderly way—with that situation facing us, how are we going to apply the yardstick of equality between industry and agriculture if we do not obtain the facts?

Mr. BORAH. I would proceed precisely as we did in 1921. If I had under consideration industry, of course I would apply the same rule to it that I would to agriculture, to wit, the difference between cost of production at home and abroad. I would make no distinction and would not discriminate against industry upon that principle. What I am contending for is that we do not at this time take up the question of the industries. The Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] sotto voce says the House has already done it. That does not make any difference whatever with reference to the proposition now before us. The Senate can control its investigation and determine upon what schedules it will consider and what commodities it will pass upon just as if the House had not passed upon them.

Mr. EDGE. Does the Senator, knowing the parliamentary situation of such procedure perfectly well, think a more satisfactory tariff bill for either agriculture or industry, or both, would be written by the conference committee with the House having given the consideration they have to the industrial schedules and to agriculture, and with the Senate absolutely refusing to give any consideration to industry, but sending over such changes as they see fit to make in the agriculture schedules alone? Does the Senator approve of that method of legislating?

Mr. BORAH. I do in these circumstances because I think the House ought not to have considered those schedules under the present condition of affairs in the special session.

Mr. EDGE. The facts are that the House have some rights in the matter, and in my judgment have prior rights, and they have already done so.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BINGHAM. While the Senator from New Jersey and the Senator from Idaho were discussing this particular point I wanted to call attention to the fact that in the President's message the words "limited revision" were not used. Actually what the President said, in the paragraph immediately preceding that read by the Senator from New Jersey, and previously referred to in the debate, was this:

Nevertheless, economic changes have taken place during that time—

That is, since 1922—

which have placed certain domestic products at a disadvantage—

That, I assume, refers to agriculture—

and new industries have come into being, all of which creates the necessity for some limited changes in the schedules—

He does not say in the agricultural schedules; he does not limit it all. He says—

some limited changes in the schedules and in the administrative clauses of the laws as written in 1922.

Then, in order to explain what is meant by "limited changes in the schedules," he goes on in the very next sentence:

It would seem to me that the test of necessity for revision is, in the main, whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years.

How in the world is the Finance Committee or the Senate or the Congress to know whether there has been a substantial slackening in any industry if we are not to have the condition of that industry investigated?

Mr. BORAH. All I have to say in regard to that is that, so far as the House of Representatives is concerned, it gave no regard to that rule whatever. As to the slackening of industry and unemployment, in the case of at least three or four industries, it can not be said that it paid any attention whatever to that rule.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey yield for a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Mississippi?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. These quotations are from utterances of the President made some time ago. Is there any Senator on the other side of the Chamber close enough to the President to state what he meant when he talked about a "limited revision" of the tariff?

Mr. EDGE. I can not answer the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. I did not think the Senator from New Jersey could do so.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, without presuming for a moment to speak for the President—in fact, I have had no conversation with him on the subject at all and I do not want to be misunderstood—but having known the public character of the President for a number of years, it would seem quite evident when in his campaign he delivered the speech in Boston

in which he called attention to the necessity for tariff revision, and when in his message calling this session together he called attention to the kind of revision he wanted, that it would be almost lacking in courtesy or in appreciation of his honesty as the leader of a great party to suggest that he has changed his mind since he sent in his message at the beginning of the extra session.

The fact remains, Mr. President, with all due respect to the Senator from Idaho, that although he had a great deal to do with calling into being this extraordinary session, he hoped that it would be limited to agricultural products solely, and was very much annoyed to find that it was not so limited in the paragraph of the President's message to which I have just referred. Now, the Senator from Idaho is trying to get the Senate to agree with him. I do not blame him in the least, but I do not like the suggestion that we have changed our position since the campaign.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator from Connecticut was one of the Senators who did not want a special session at all.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Does anybody here contend that we are to be controlled entirely by some expression of the President? I have been laboring under the impression that we were charged with a duty, and have the constitutional power to discharge that duty according to our best judgment.

Mr. BORAH. I was under that impression also until the debenture proposition came up.

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Even then perhaps he was right; I thought he was. I wish to have explained at some stage of the discussion the point I have suggested. If I am to be governed by party pronouncements, I take my stand upon the Republican platform. I have to add, however, that I see no disagreement between that platform and any utterance of the President of the United States.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I will conclude my remarks in just a moment, although I am always willing to be interrupted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. The increase in the tariff on agricultural products will increase the price which the farmer gets for his products. Is not that true?

Mr. EDGE. That is the theory.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will not the price of the things which the farmer buys be increased under the increased rates of the tariff?

Mr. EDGE. That is the same theory.

Mr. TYDINGS. If we increase the tariff on what the farmer has to sell on the one hand and then take it away from him on the other hand by increasing the tariff on the commodities he must buy, is the farmer relieved by the tariff bill?

Mr. EDGE. Some of us are trying to find the proper balance, and the Senator from Idaho, I will say very frankly—I have read his statement and I concur absolutely in that portion of it at least—has announced that is his viewpoint, as it is my viewpoint, that a proper protective tariff should represent the difference in the cost of production at home and production abroad, plus transportation and other expenses.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further to me?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield further to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will there be any profit for the farmer if we increase his ability to buy and then raise the price of the things which he has to buy equivalent to that increase in his ability to buy?

Mr. EDGE. The best answer to that, Mr. President, is that we have done this thing many times during the last 70 years, the last time being in 1922. We had dire prophecies of disaster, but two Republican Presidents have been elected since that time, and if the theory is wrong it will be for the American people alone to decide.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Of course, under that situation, the farmer could continue to reduce his cost of living and have his living conditions impaired.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. EDGE. I yield further to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. The Senator did not give me a direct answer to my question.

Mr. EDGE. The people of the United States gave a direct answer to the question at the last election and the election preceding.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; they gave their answer on the issue that a certain man should stay over on the other side of the water at that time. But if the price of the farmer's products will yield him more profit under increased tariff rates, and yet he is forced to pay more for the goods he has to buy, I do not think, as a matter of logic, that the Senator can maintain that the farmer will get any practical benefit if both the tariff on his products and the tariff on what he buys shall be raised.

Mr. EDGE. I do not understand the Senator's reference to somebody on the other side.

Mr. TYDINGS. Well, I have little faith in what the election decides, because usually the worst demagogue wins. However, I should still like to get an answer to my question as to how the farmer can get any benefit under the tariff if the tariff on the commodities he buys is to be increased in proportion to the increase in the tariff on the commodities which he sells.

Mr. EDGE. If the farmer proceeds to market his goods at a profit under the Republican protective tariff, which we certainly hope he can do, when he makes a profit, just as when the manufacturer makes a profit, he is able to move along quite satisfactorily.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if we raise the price of the things which he has to buy, so that his profit is all dissipated when he comes to buy, he is in exactly the same position as he was before.

Mr. EDGE. We are trying to work out a tariff bill which will raise his profit sufficiently so that he will be able to share in the prosperity of the industrialists, and, so far as I am concerned, I am absolutely committed to that viewpoint.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Jersey yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. KING. May I say to the Senator, in view of his repeated reference to the tariff of 1922, that one of the reasons assigned by my Republican friends at that time, and by some Democrats, for the enormously high rates was to benefit, first, the manufacturer, and it was contended that there would leak down to the farmers and to the agricultural interests of the United States sufficient benefit so that they would likewise be profited by the tariff act. In other words, it was an act in the interest of agriculture as well as manufacturing. Now my Republican friend from New Jersey contends that the farmers are not prosperous; that they were not benefited by that act; and he proposes, as I understand him, now to give the benefit to the farmers by increasing the tariff upon their products, but at the same time to increase the tariff upon manufactured products, so that the present disparity will be perpetuated, if not increased.

Mr. EDGE. Of course, the Senator from Utah knows perfectly well that the Senator from New Jersey does not think anything of the kind; but I am not going to take time to enter into the usual traditional tariff debate, so far as the difference between the viewpoint held by the Senator from Utah and that held by the Senator from New Jersey is concerned. If I may be permitted to conclude my remarks, I will return to the thought that I presented at the opening. I can not subscribe to the necessity of abrogating the recognized responsibility as well as the prerogatives of a standing committee in order to consider the pending tariff bill. I repeat that, because I think I have made clear that in either event the Senate must face the duty of considering the industrial schedules. Therefore, I can not understand why Senators would not prefer to face that responsibility with sworn testimony and evidence at their command. By adopting the pending resolution we will save nothing in time, but will lose a great deal in the opportunity to carry out an important responsibility in a businesslike manner.

If by the passage of the so-called Borah resolution we could eliminate discussion of industrial schedules, there might be some reason for its adoption, but that can not possibly be accomplished. The House bill is before us; the House bill must be acted on; the House bill must be returned with whatever changes the Senate shall adopt. Why, under those circumstances, individual Senators should be denied an opportunity to have the facts is beyond my comprehension.

It seems that those who take the opposite viewpoint from that which I am endeavoring to express proceed on the theory that a sort of blanket indictment is justified against the industrial rates on the ground that they are too high; that the industries are robbing everybody else. I do not question in the slightest degree that some of the tariff rates affecting industrial schedules are too high, but the only way in the world that we can prove that is to go through the course of procedure the Finance Committee has adopted.

It is unfair to the industrial world to say, as has been asserted time after time, that the industrial schedules are robbing the people. If they are robbing the people, let us have the facts under oath. The Finance Committee is organized for that purpose. The Democratic members of the committee are there to cross-examine every witness and to secure legal testimony, so that for the first time in the history of the Congress when we finish our hearings we can present to this body legal evidence upon which the tariff may properly, judiciously, and fairly be formulated. I repeat, if industrial schedules are unjust, why refuse to secure the facts?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator a question or rather make an observation in that connection.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator from Indiana desires to make an observation, I will yield the floor to him.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I want the Senator to answer the question. As I understand, Mr. President, some of the Members of this body, most of them on the other side and some on this side, insisted that the House should vote on the question of debenture, stating that they could not be excused from that responsibility, and finally they had their way, and the House did vote on the debenture. Now, the House sends over here a tariff bill. Is it not inconsistent for us now to refuse to vote on the House bill, when some of our Members have very recently insisted that the House vote on a Senate amendment?

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator desires my viewpoint, supplementing his, the fact is that we insisted through two efforts, finally successfully, to have the House vote on the debenture plan when they argued—I can not attempt to settle the merits of the discussion—that there was a constitutional question involved; and yet they receded and did vote. In this case, however, there can not be any constitutional question involved, excepting a constitutional responsibility on the part of the House to initiate a tariff bill. No one can question that. They have performed their constitutional responsibility; the bill has been transmitted to the Senate; and now we proceed to tell them that we will not vote upon it, or at least that we will not consider it in the usual way in which bills are considered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And if the House were to be considered discourteous to the Senate in refusing to vote on a question that did involve a matter of constitutionality, is not the Senate even more discourteous now, when that question is not involved, in refusing to vote on a question submitted to the Senate by the House?

Mr. EDGE. I should certainly think so.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I shall not speak more than a few minutes on this question.

The first matter to which I desired to ask attention, though, was that which was just touched on by the Senator from New Jersey in his reply to the Senator from Indiana. Under the Constitution, of course, the House had the sole right to initiate this legislation. Having that right, it had the equal right to determine what schedules it would consider and what not. It had a right to interpret the message of the President as it saw fit, and to send us a bill that, in its judgment, was necessary to bring both agricultural and general business rates up to a sufficiently protective level. Therefore, it is utterly incongruous for us to attack the House as if they had no right to do what they did.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I have not heard any attack upon the House. Has the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I have. I thought I heard several attacks on the House.

Mr. BORAH. It is no discourtesy to the House to disagree with them as to a bill, I trust.

Mr. REED. It is a discourtesy to the House to refuse even to consider the amendments they have put in a tariff bill.

Mr. BORAH. We would have a perfect right, without any discourtesy whatever to the House, to report back here a bill striking out everything except the enacting clause and substituting a wholly new bill.

Mr. REED. Quite true; but it is a profound discourtesy to the House, in my judgment, for us to instruct our committee not even to consider the action of the House on these other schedules.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. REED. I yield next to the Senator from Indiana; but I want to retract my promise to finish in 10 minutes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Idaho himself to say this morning that the House had acted in a manner displeasing to him, and that if the House had acted in a manner pleasing to him he would not have offered this resolution. That may not be discourteous, but it is something like it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Idaho to reply.

Mr. BORAH. I did not consider it a discourtesy to disagree with the provisions of the House bill; and if there were not a very great exigency here I doubt if anybody would suggest it.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana and Mr. BINGHAM addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I did understand the Senator to say, however, that because the House had acted in the manner it had—and the inference certainly was there that the action of the House was not correct—that because it had acted in that way, the Senator insisted on offering this resolution to hobble and hamstring the Senate, and reduce the Members thereof in some degree to a form of intellectual servitude.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BINGHAM. May I say to my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania—I think he was here at the time—that it is my recollection that the Senator from Idaho used the words "bad faith" in connection with what the House had done; and if that is not a reflection on the Members of the House, or at least the majority of the House who passed the bill, I do not understand the use of the words "bad faith" or the use of the word "reflection."

Mr. BORAH. The great sensitiveness of the Members of the Senate in regard to the House now is very appealing to me. I intended no discourtesy to the House when I said that I wholly disagreed with the House bill, and I wholly disbelieved that it is in accordance with the President's message. That, to my mind, is no discourtesy to the House. It is a difference of opinion.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, this debate is showing more and more that for a Senator to have the floor merely converts him into a standing instead of a sitting audience. [Laughter.] In the chinks in the conversation, so to speak, I have just two or three suggestions that I should like to make.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH. Before the Senator does that let me say that I should be very glad if we could amend the rules, while we are amending them, so that a Senator who has the floor really will have the floor. No one suffers more than myself from interruptions.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair might state that no Senator is obliged to yield unless he desires to do so.

Mr. BORAH. I understand that perfectly, and have understood it for some time.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if the Senator from Pennsylvania will yield, there is no one who shows more courtesy in yielding than the Senator from Idaho.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield; and to whom?

Mr. REED. To anyone, Mr. President. [Laughter.]

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Pennsylvania has the floor.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. If the Senator from Pennsylvania will permit me, I should like to propound just one other question to the distinguished Senator from Idaho.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I object. [Laughter.]

Mr. REED. I think I will ask the Senator to do his propounding in his own time.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. All right. I was simply going to ask a question.

Mr. REED. Last Thursday I made a half hour's speech on the unfinished business at that time, and I finished it 4 hours and 15 minutes after I started; and I was supposed to have the floor all that time. I shall not take so long now.

What I meant by saying that this would be a discourtesy to the House is that the adoption of a resolution instructing our committee not to give any consideration to certain action of the House in advance of any study of the questions involved, without hearing any witnesses, is, in my judgment, a deep discourtesy. I say the adoption of this resolution would be and should be offensive to the House of Representatives. But let us suppose, now, that the resolution were adopted, and, as practical legislators, let us see how it would work out. Let us consider the mechanism of the process by which we would try to find what were agricultural products and their related industries, or whatever the phrase is.

This morning, with the courtesy of the Senator from Idaho, I gave one instance—that of a chemical known as butyl acetate, which we came upon in our investigations a day or two ago. It is one of the materials that go into the making of photographic films—kodak films, moving-picture films, and things of that sort. I should have said, in my ignorance, "Why, this strangely named chemical, butyl acetate, which is used for making kodak films, certainly has nothing to do with agriculture. Why should we consider that? We have had orders from the Senate not to consider anything but agricultural products." And yet, when we called the first witness on that subject, we discovered that this chemical is made from fermented corn, usually the poorest grade of corn, the sort of thing that a farmer can not sell; and last year alone 8,000,000 bushels of corn went into the manufacture of that strange chemical!

Had we acted in the best of good faith in carrying out such a resolution as that proposed by the Senator from Idaho, we would have passed that over, and we would not have heard a witness. We would have said, "Why, that has nothing to do with agriculture. We will not even hear you. You men have come to Washington to testify. No matter how important to you your industry may be, it is not important to the farmer; so go on back home, unheard."

You see, in the actual working out of the thing we can not run down the bill and select out those items that relate to agriculture. You have to have your hearings first, before you know whether they do or do not; and when the House has had its hearings on the subject, and the House as a body has acted, and our committee has had its hearings and made its investigation, how much time are we going to save for the sake of agriculture if we merely throw that subject out of consideration after hearing the witnesses, or if we act on the information we have? When the bill comes before the Senate, somebody who is interested in butyl acetate, or whatever the topic may be, will offer the amendment here, so that in the Senate at least as much time is going to be devoted to each item as if this resolution had never passed. And then we go to conference, only partly informed, to deal with the House, already offended by our action in refusing to consider on its merits what they have done; and we certainly are not going to abbreviate the process of conference by that method. So the Senate will readily see that from the standpoint of saving time this resolution will cost us time instead of saving it for us.

Then let us consider some other illustrations of the same thing.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator permit a question?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield to the Senator from Utah?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that any person with ordinary intelligence, or with the aid of some Tariff Commission representative, could go through this bill and in two hours, or at least half a day, very easily point out the items that might come within the category of agricultural relief?

Mr. REED. That is a very interesting suggestion, and this is a great chance to try it out, because the Senator from Utah, who asks me the question, has far more than ordinary intelligence; and I should like to ask him how he would solve three or four typical questions. Would the Senator say that cotton textiles were agricultural products within the meaning of the Borah resolution, and could be considered?

Mr. KING. Does the Senator ask me that question?

Mr. REED. Yes; I am asking that question of the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. If the Borah resolution declares for the consideration only of agricultural products and all related commodities, I will readily admit that many might determine that tex-

tiles that were the product of cotton would come within the provisions of the resolution.

Mr. REED. I see. Then on the language of the original Borah resolution, which limits our study to the agricultural and directly related schedules the Senator would consider the tariff on cotton textiles? Is that right?

Mr. KING. I said that many would consider that that was a related product.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I beg the Senator's pardon. I want him to tell us what he would say.

Mr. KING. Oh, well, I shall reserve my judgment upon that.

Mr. REED. Then the Senator is not so clearly and deeply convinced that it is or is not a directly related product that he would undertake to tell us now what his view is?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I want to be entirely frank with my friend, because he is always very frank with me, and, I know, with the Senate. My interpretation is that textiles which were the direct product of cotton would come within that category; but, let me ask the Senator, can there be any controversy as to hundreds and thousands of items comprehended within a general tariff bill as to whether or not they would be allocated under the head of agricultural products? Would coal? Would manganese?

Mr. REED. There would be endless controversy as to whether they were directly related products, and the Senator and I, I am afraid, in all our friendship, would not ever agree about cotton textiles or woolen textiles, or shoes. Whoever thought a shoe was an agricultural product? But if you are going to protect hides you have to consider shoes or you will drive the entire shoe-manufacturing industry out of the United States.

Mr. GLENN and Mr. EDGE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. JOHNSON in the chair). Does the Senator from Pennsylvania yield?

Mr. REED. I yield first to the Senator from Illinois, who first asked me to yield.

Mr. GLENN. I think, if I correctly understood the author of the resolution this morning, he stated, in answer to a question asked him, or asked the Senator from Utah, that he would not consider textiles within the purview of the resolution.

Mr. REED. I so understood him, and that is why I was glad to get the opinion of the Senator from Utah if I could.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, that is a point to which I wanted to call attention. The Senator from Utah said it was directly related. The Senator from Idaho, in answering me earlier in the day, said it was not directly related. There you have two leaders who do not agree.

Mr. REED. Precisely, and let me suggest to the Senator from Washington, at whom a rather derisive remark about shingles was directed this morning, that if I had to interpret the Borah resolution I should say that shingles are just as much agricultural articles as corncocks are.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield there?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DILL. From the standpoint of securing a tariff on shingles the Borah resolution would be to the advantage of those who want such a tariff because it would probably be interpreted to shut out any evidence against having such a tariff and just arbitrarily strike them off, and if the Borah resolution were not adopted, those who opposed the tariff on shingles could come in and present their evidence. So from that standpoint those of us who want the tariff would be better off.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. KING. I want to qualify an observation I made. If there was a tariff and the raw article was not dealt with, then obviously under the Borah resolution there would be no consideration given to the schedules affecting the finished products.

Mr. REED. I am not sure why that is obvious. If woolen textiles are kindred to the agricultural products of wool, and therefore we can consider woolen textiles, why can we not also consider cotton textiles on the same theory?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. May I suggest that that would scarcely be a limitation? If a duty is imposed upon agricultural products entering into manufactures, it would be absolutely necessary to put compensatory duties upon such manufactures.

Mr. REED. Precisely.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. That would be necessarily implied, it would seem to me. Accordingly if you increased the tariff on woolens, as in the bill as it passed the House, then you would put a duty on the manufactured products of wool; so that those would be related. If there is no duty on cotton, I find it difficult to conceive how, under the Borah resolution, cotton textiles would be regarded as falling within the scope of the resolution.

Mr. REED. My recollection is not definite, but I think there is a duty on long-staple cotton.

Mr. HARRISON. No. There was, but it was repealed.

Mr. SMOOT. There is a proposition to put a duty on it now.

Mr. REED. Whatever we do with the tariff on long-staple cotton, or whatever we do with the tariff on ordinary cotton, leaving it on the free list is tariff action.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. The same situation exists with respect to shoes. Of course, shoes are not agricultural products, not ever so considered, but if you put a duty on hides, justice requires that you put a compensatory duty on shoes.

Mr. REED. Of course, that is so. That is what I tried to explain a moment ago when I said that if you did not, you would drive the whole industry of shoe manufacturing out of the country. Yet when we begin to consider shoes under a limitation to agricultural products, we have ourselves in a strange paradox.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. NORBECK. The difficulty is not in understanding that shoes call for a tariff if hides do; the difficulty is in understanding why, if you put a 50-cent duty on the hide, it should call for putting \$10 on shoes made from that hide.

Mr. REED. I have not heard anybody suggest a \$10 duty on shoes.

Mr. NORBECK. Twenty per cent ad valorem.

Mr. REED. I do not know much about \$50 shoes.

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator is not fair in his statement.

Mr. REED. What is unfair about it?

Mr. NORBECK. The Senator said \$50 shoes, did he not?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. NORBECK. The number of shoes that are made from a hide, a great number of pairs, each having 20 per cent ad valorem, will run the tariff on the products of one hide up to \$10.

Mr. REED. Of course, a large part of that cost is labor.

Mr. NORBECK. Yes; but the excuse for that duty is the 50-cent tariff placed on the cowhide. It is based on that alone to start with.

Mr. REED. Let me go on farther and show why, in justice to the farmer, this resolution should not pass. There are a number of articles, and some of them of great importance, in this bill, now taxable, which ought, by every law of common sense, to go on the free list. Those inevitably affect the farmer.

Take steel and manufactures of steel. There is no duty on ordinary steel products under the 1922 law. Nobody has suggested any duty on them in the proposed law, so far as I know. Yet the cheaper steel can be purchased the cheaper is going to be harvesting machinery and other steel articles which the farmer wants. That is obvious. At the present time we are putting a wholly unnecessary duty on manganese, which goes into steel manufacture. Ninety-five per cent of the manganese comes from abroad, and always will. If there was ever an item which ought to go on the free list, that is one of them.

Mr. ODDIE and Mr. SHORTRIDGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. REED. If I am right, then I ask the Senate to take that only as an illustration. I do not expect the Senator from Nevada or the Senator from Montana ever to agree with me.

Mr. ODDIE. I want to mention to the Senator the fact that manganese has been discovered in a good many of our States, and I think before this discussion is over we shall be able to bring out some facts before the Senate showing that we have an abundant supply in this country that can be relied on, and that we do not have to rely on foreign importations. Furthermore, I believe we will bring out the fact that manganese is a highly necessary item in the agricultural industry, because agricultural experts have found that the use of manganese in the soil has increased its productiveness to a very large extent.

Mr. REED. The Senator has helped me with another reason.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. Let me answer this. Perhaps I am all wrong, and perhaps the Senator from Nevada is all right, but in either event the decision is important to the farmer and ought to be made intelligently, and not made by the Senate after a debate between my friend and myself here on the floor, without the benefit of any evidence.

I yield to the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator has not forgotten that in the House they took from the free list hoes and rakes and forks, and put a 30 per cent ad valorem duty on them.

Mr. REED. I have not forgotten that, and I think that is one of the things our committee ought to scrutinize very carefully.

Mr. HARRISON. I am glad to hear the Senator say so.

Mr. REED. But we could not do it under the Borah resolution.

Mr. BORAH. But if you did it without the Borah resolution, it would be discourteous to the House.

Mr. REED. Not at all. We do not owe the House any duty of agreeing with them, but we do owe them the duty of giving some consideration to what they send us.

Mr. BORAH. The Senator is passing upon one of these items, saying it ought to be taken out, before there ever has been a hearing before the committee or any evidence produced on the subject. He is just as discourteous to the House as it is claimed I was when I differed with them with reference to the scope of the investigation.

Mr. REED. I am giving one side of it, and the Senator from Nevada gives the opposite side. We will all of us hold our judgment in abeyance until we get the evidence. We will not condemn an industry—as the Senator from Idaho this morning condemned the cement industry—by comparing the production of the whole country with the imports when he knows, or should have known, that the imports can not get more than a hundred miles in from the seaboard. It is wholly unfair to compare the importations with the production that originates in the Mississippi Valley.

Mr. BORAH. I know that the cement industry is practically a monopoly in the United States.

Mr. REED. Then, the Senator knows more than I do. I think the evidence will demonstrate the contrary.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. DILL. The Senator from Idaho may not know that Belgian cement is laid down on the Columbia River, in the Northwest, at a lower price, because of lack of a tariff, than the price at which it can be made and hauled 100 miles by our American firms.

Mr. REED. Absolutely.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. EDGE. This short colloquy in regard to cement seems to me to be one of the best illustrations that could be given to demonstrate the absolute necessity of getting the facts. The Senator from Idaho read from one letter. He apparently has reached his conclusion.

Mr. BORAH. Not from that one letter.

Mr. EDGE. I did not say he had reached his conclusion from the one letter, but he read from one letter, and apparently from various sources reached his conclusion. The Senator from Pennsylvania very properly draws attention to the fact that because of the weight of cement it can not be transported great distances on account of the freight rate. There is an honest difference of opinion. I am not criticizing the viewpoint of the Senator from Idaho. Neither am I accepting entirely the viewpoint of the Senator from Pennsylvania. But I do say there is a commodity taken from the free list and put on the dutiable list for the first time, and if there ever was an illustration of the fact that the Senate should have the facts, this furnishes it. That is an absolute innovation in our tariff.

Mr. BINGHAM. The colloquy between the Senator from Pennsylvania and the Senator from Nevada in regard to manganese is an illustration of the fact that Senators differ, and that they ought to have the information in regard to the matter but have not it.

Mr. REED. Let me give the Senate one or two further illustrations, perhaps just as a reminder of the multitude of details that go into one of these tariff bills. I have been impressed afresh at every day's hearing with the great variety and complexity of the industry of this country, and somewhat humiliated by my own ignorance on very many of the topics that come up for discussion in these hearings.

For example, the House has increased the duty on powdered chalk. It has been shown to us by some of the witnesses—and perhaps they are right; we have not closed the hearings—that the duty imposed on powdered chalk is of no benefit except to factories that employ about 200 men in America, and will put out of business the putty industry. I did not know there was powdered chalk in putty; perhaps other Senators did not know that. It will put out of business the American calcimine industry, which at present exports to the whole Western Hemisphere, all for the benefit of three or four very small powdering establishments employing a couple of hundred men.

I would not have known anything about that had we not had the hearings on it. But powdered chalk is not an agricultural commodity. Yet every farmer uses calcimine. Do we want to raise the price of calcimine to the farmer \$6 or \$7 a ton, or do we not? How can we tell until we have a hearing?

Mr. BORAH. All of which illustrates the worth of these hearings. The House called 1,100 witnesses, had hearings for

two or three months, and made this awful blunder of which the Senator has spoken.

Mr. REED. I do not know yet whether or not it is an awful blunder, but I do know that very much of what the House has done has been accepted by both sides. Let me give another illustration. The House took no action, and, so far as I know—I have not investigated it fully—had no hearings on the matter of the tariff on automobiles. I have the impression that we could, with advantage to the United States, entirely remove that item from the dutiable schedule, and that it would be to the great advantage of our foreign trade to do that. Under the Borah resolution we could not look at it, because an automobile is not an agricultural product, although, if my eyes have borne me true witness in riding through the agricultural States of the Middle West, there is an automobile on every farm in that bankrupt region.

Mr. BROOKHART. Mr. President, the Senator seems to have decided that the tariff on automobiles ought to be removed, and I agree with him that it ought to be. I do not see any occasion for any hearings on that in any of the subcommittees. He can offer that as an amendment from the floor, and we can pass it.

Mr. REED. If such an amendment were offered, I would vote against it in my present state of absence of information. I do not believe we ought to act blindly in regard to a vast industry like that. But I have been told by many men in the business that they think it would be to their interest, and to the interest of the country, to repeal that particular duty. This is something which ought to be investigated and acted on with information, not blindly. I would vote against the suggestion right now because I would not want to act ignorantly, but I would like to investigate it.

Those witnesses coming before us are human beings like ourselves, and, like us, are very largely made up of selfishness. Of course they speak out of selfishness, as does every other human being. The world would fly apart if it were not held together by intelligent selfishness. Tariff bills always will be based on the selfish interests of the Nation. That is the reason why we have a Nation of individuals whose selfish interests run practically alike. It is no reflection on a tariff bill to say the men who testified were selfish. We have had some examples of extreme intelligence and farsighted selfishness, and I want to instance one that occurred Saturday.

The largest importer of camphor in the United States asked us to take camphor off the free list and expose it to a heavy tariff. That sounded so strange that of course we at once asked his motive. He replied, "At present Japan has complete monopoly of natural gum camphor. Germany has a complete practical monopoly of synthetic camphor. At present we are absolutely at the mercy of those two nations. I hope you will put a duty on it and make us pay more, because in the long run it will create an industry in this country that will make synthetic camphor, and we will be independent of the monopolies in those two other countries." If that is not an intelligent selfishness I can not imagine what would be.

I think I have given enough illustrations to show that the consideration we are giving to the bill will in many cases result in decreases in the present tariff to the advantage of the farmer and townsmen alike. I think the committee ought to be permitted to go ahead and do its work intelligently instead of forcing us to fight out here on the floor of the Senate a lot of those issues with no proof save the unsworn assertions of Senators on the different sides of the controversy who in the best of faith may make mistaken statements. We will go at it much more intelligently if we are working on a record of testimony from witnesses who know the facts of their own knowledge.

Finally, Mr. President, if anyone will travel through the country that lies to the north of us he will find that all the distress in the world is not in the Corn Belt of the Mississippi Valley. Drive from here to New York City. Go through Reading. There will be found half a dozen blast furnaces stone cold. They have not run for years. Why? Because the iron that they would have made had they run has been furnished by a company in British India which pays its laborers from 11 to 14 cents for a 9-hour day and whose freight rates from India to Philadelphia are almost as low as the rates from the central Pennsylvania furnaces to Philadelphia. The labor difference is about 90 per cent of the American cost. That industry to-day is dead. The farms of the Middle West are running, but the blast furnaces north of here are stone cold. The villages are disappearing. The population is going and yet they are just as good Americans, just as much entitled to our protection, as the farmer who drives to town in his own automobile to-night to see the movies.

Go up through the coal fields and you will find whole counties prostrate. They, too, have an overcapacity like the wheat farmers of the Northwest. Those people, if relief could be brought to them, need relief just as much as those who will get the advantage of the \$150,000,000 appropriation we have made this afternoon. They are just as good American citizens as the farmers of the Middle West. They are entitled to no more, but just as much consideration. Why we should pass a bill to help one group of citizens and neglect another group I am utterly unable to understand. For that reason I hope the resolution will be defeated.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, in reply to some things which were said by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] this afternoon when he so courteously yielded to me at various times, I would like to point out the fact that on the 7th of March, three days after he became President, Mr. Hoover sent out his call for the extraordinary session and in that call there was nothing limiting legislation to agriculture. His proclamation was quite short. The second paragraph of it reads as follows:

Whereas legislation to effect further agricultural relief and legislation for the limited changes in the tariff can not in justice to our farmers, our labor, and our manufacturers be postponed.

It seems to me there is only one inference which may be drawn from that statement, and that is that when on the 7th of March the President decided that the public interests required that the Congress of the United States should be convened in extraordinary session it was to effect further agricultural relief to help the farmers, to help labor, and to help the manufacturers, and specifically so stated. Therefore it seems to me not only lacking in courtesy to the House but lacking in courtesy to the President, who called us in extra session because he believed the country needed an extra session, not to have hearings covering the needs of the manufacturer just as much as the needs of the farmer. If that sentence means anything, it means just that thing.

Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho stated a few moments ago that I was opposed to the extra session. I do not know where he derived that information. I certainly never opposed it in any public speech. I certainly never went to the President of the United States, either solicited or unsolicited, and asked him not to call an extra session. It happens that I believe that an extra session frequently leads to a good deal of trouble and does not always accomplish that for which it is called, notably the session that was called to consider the subsidy for the American merchant marine. It happens that I had planned to go with other commissioners appointed by the President to study the situation in a very small group of islands concerning a very small number of people, but a situation which was believed to be acute and needing attention, and that for that reason I hoped that I might have the opportunity of doing whatever little service might be performed in that way even though the weather were very hot there, and not have to devote myself all summer to an extra session.

Therefore I was not anxious to see an extra session come; but whether I favored it or not has not the slightest thing to do with the argument nor with the question as to whether we are going to do what the President called us together to do in his proclamation and what he specifically asked us to do in his message to Congress. I maintain that the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho is in direct contravention with the proclamation of the President and the President's first message.

The Senator from Idaho has offered a number of animadversions about bad faith in the campaign and has accused me of not talking about the tariff during the campaign, as though it were a matter which was of very great importance one way or the other. He said the principal issue of the campaign was agriculture and the immediate need for helping agriculture.

It is very natural for all of us to listen chiefly to our own speeches. Sometimes there is no one else to listen. Fortunately, the Senator from Idaho, for one, has never failed in having a large audience. He addressed most magnificent audiences during the campaign. He did more than any other person perhaps, at least outside of the leaders of the two parties, to determine the results of the campaign and to help those results forward, and I respect him for it.

It is true that in his speeches he made no reference, or very little reference—I regret that I did not have the opportunity more than two or three times of listening to them over the radio—to the necessities of industry, for any relief to be brought to the manufacturers referred to in the President's message. Therefore it is perfectly natural that he should say that the principal interest in the campaign and the principal issue was farm relief.

But if he had had to listen to speeches in Connecticut, and I do not refer only to those which I made, but to others, he would have heard a great deal about the tariff, because in that State, although agriculture is our special business and although our people are deeply interested in the schedules on dairy products, still our principal business is manufacturing. Many of our manufacturers are having an extremely hard time. Some are closing; others will have to close in the near future if they do not get relief. Some have been holding on for several years in the hope that the Tariff Commission might get around to studying their question sufficiently to make a recommendation.

May I quote just a few words from two speeches, one of which I made on September 17, 1928, in which, while referring to the candidate of the Republican Party, I said:

With his wide knowledge of world affairs he has been able to foster our foreign trade in the face of increasing foreign competition as no previous Secretary has ever done. With his training as an engineer and his genius for arriving at the best and most efficient way of doing things, he has played a stupendous part in the elimination of waste in many of our industries, and it is that increased efficiency which enables our factories to hold their own in world competition. At the same time, with his personal knowledge of foreign living conditions, he knows how supremely important it is for us to maintain the protective tariff. He appreciates fully that if his dream of happy homes for America is to come true, we can not afford to allow our markets to be flooded by products made by poorly paid foreign labor. The Democrats claim that they have recently been converted to this doctrine, but only a few months ago the Democratic candidate for Vice President and those who follow his leadership in the Senate voted that the tariff should be lowered and declined to agree to my amendment, which stated that there were certain articles on which the tariff should be increased.

Following that, in a speech delivered over the radio for the Columbia broadcasting chain on Friday, October 12, the subject of the address being "Hoover, the Builder," I stated:

If you ask me what Hoover is going to build with in the future, I can give you a long list of tools and building material, but I will content myself with only three. . . .

In the second place, Hoover is going to use another important Republican contribution to American building material, namely, the protective tariff, which our friends the Democrats have been fighting for many years, even down to last winter, when nearly every Democratic Senator went on record as favoring a lowering of the tariff. In his speech in Tennessee Hoover said:

"I advocate strengthening of the protective tariff as Henry Clay, of Kentucky, advocated it"—

He did not say, "I advocate strengthening the agricultural schedules alone." He said:

"I advocate strengthening of the protective tariff as Henry Clay, of Kentucky, advocated it; not as an abstract economic theory but as a practical and definite policy of protecting the standards of living of the American family. The purpose of the tariff is not to balance the books of business corporations, but to safeguard the family budget. With increasing pressure from countries of lower standards of living it has become the fundamental safeguard of the American workman and the American farmer. A retreat to the Underwood tariff schedule on farm produce would ruin millions of our farmers to-day."

That is the end of his quotation. Now, if I may be pardoned for quoting from my own remarks for a moment, I went on then to say:

It is fair to state that one of the principal tools with which Hoover will have to build is the protective tariff.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President—

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield to the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho certainly needs no defense at my poor hands, but I should like to observe that what he has been contending for at this short session of Congress is what he said Mr. Hoover stood for prior to the election, and the only difference now is that the Senator is exactly where he was before the election, although some of those for whom he spoke are not in the same place.

Mr. BINGHAM. The speech of President Hoover, from which I quoted, was delivered in Tennessee before the election. Furthermore, in his Boston speech, which was delivered on Monday evening, October 15, Mr. Hoover discussed at considerable length the question of the tariff as being a most important point. That speech, which was delivered in the heart of New England, was listened to by practically everyone in New England who had a radio, for all were interested to know what he thought about the tariff. There had been, as the Senator from Idaho has said, a great deal of talk about farm relief and other matters in the other speeches of the President, but when the President

came into that section of the country, whose very bread and butter depends upon the tariff, he particularly wanted them to know what he thought about it. If the Senator desires I will read from that speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. Will the Senator let me interrupt him at that point?

Mr. BINGHAM. And that speech was delivered three or four weeks before the election.

Mr. TYDINGS. I agree with what the Senator says, but let me point out to him—

Mr. SHORTRIDGE. Mr. President—

Mr. TYDINGS. I will ask the Senator, please, to let me finish the colloquy with the Senator from Connecticut. Mr. Hoover made only about four campaign speeches, and in only one of those speeches, as I recall, did he take up the subject of farm relief. On the other hand, the Senator from Idaho made dozens of campaign speeches to exceptionally large audiences. Mr. Hoover remained silent while the Senator from Idaho was saying what the President would do if he were elected. I listened to a great many of the speeches of the Senator from Idaho, and certainly no one—

Mr. BINGHAM. Did they convert the Senator?

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes; they did largely, and that is the reason I am voting with the Senator from Idaho in this instance.

Mr. BINGHAM. Is he voting as the Senator from Idaho asked him to?

Mr. TYDINGS. We were both for the same thing then, and we are both for the same thing now.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, both were for Mr. Hoover during the campaign?

Mr. TYDINGS. Oh, no; I had better sense than that. However, I should like to say to the Senator that it is recognized that the Senator from Idaho brought more votes to the now President of the United States than any other 15 men in the whole country together.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator mean including the Democratic Party? [Laughter.]

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not jesting. The Senator can rely on a jest when he can not controvert my statements by cold facts.

Mr. BINGHAM. I beg the Senator's pardon; I am far from jesting. I have heard mentioned the names of certain members of the Democratic Party who contributed very largely to the result of the campaign.

Mr. TYDINGS. If Mr. Hoover then remained silent, knowing that the Senator from Idaho was interpreting his position on the farm-relief program during all the time when the Senator from Idaho occupied the front page of almost all the dailies, it ill behooves the President now to take issue with the position set forth by the Senator from Idaho.

This was to be a farm-relief session. The President said specifically, after a visit of the Senator from Idaho to the White House just before the session was called, that there would be a session called to deal with farm relief; and certainly, after the support which the Senator from Idaho secured for him before the election, I do not think those who supported Mr. Hoover can with good grace take issue or find fault when the Senator from Idaho is simply trying to do now what he said Mr. Hoover would do if he were elected.

Mr. BINGHAM. Does the Senator from Maryland say that Mr. Hoover only referred to farm relief in one of his speeches?

Mr. TYDINGS. No; I say that he made one speech dealing with farm relief as a subject. Most of his speeches dealt with nothing except happier homes.

Mr. BINGHAM. That seems to have been a fairly popular topic. I should also call attention of the Senator from Maryland to the fact that if there is basis for his argument, there is equal basis for a tariff argument, for in only one of his speeches did Mr. Hoover stress the tariff. In other words, having decided to let the Democrats do most of the talking and be elected on that basis, it was not necessary for him to mention the tariff in more than one speech or to mention farm relief in more than one speech.

Mr. TYDINGS. I will observe that with the mass mind in this country as it is, the best way to get elected is to do no talking, and I suppose that accounts for much of the majority that a certain candidate received at the last election.

Mr. BINGHAM. That is an astonishing statement coming from the Senator from Maryland, who only a few hours or perhaps minutes ago said on the floor of the Senate—and I trust I shall quote him correctly—that the way to get elected in these days was to be a prize demagogue and that no one could be elected unless he had demagogic characteristics.

Mr. TYDINGS. And there was ample proof of the accuracy of that statement at the late November election.

Mr. BINGHAM. But now the Senator claims that the way to get elected is to say nothing. If to say nothing is the trade-

mark of a demagogue, then we shall have to change our attitude toward demagogues.

Mr. TYDINGS. When a man is selected to be a leader and has not sufficient courage to lead, he becomes the worst kind of a demagogue.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Maryland yield to me for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Connecticut yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. BINGHAM. I yield the floor, although I will be glad to yield to the Senator if he wishes to ask me a question.

Mr. WHEELER. I notice the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from New Jersey both lay great stress upon the fact that in his Boston speech the then candidate for President, Mr. Hoover, now President Hoover, emphasized the tariff, and they said that the people up in that section generally heard that speech. I was wondering if that was the reason why both Massachusetts and Rhode Island went Democratic.

Mr. BINGHAM. In other words, Mr. President, my friend from Montana agrees with the very brilliant remark made by the Senator from Maryland, that the best way to get elected is to say nothing, because he infers that having talked about the tariff that was the reason why he was defeated in those States.

Mr. WHEELER. No; I do not. The Senator apparently does not understand the question I asked him. I said that I understood the Senator laid great emphasis upon the fact that Mr. Hoover made a speech on the tariff in Boston.

Mr. BINGHAM. I did so in answer to the argument made on the floor by the Senator from Maryland that Mr. Hoover had not talked about the tariff until after the election and that the quotations from Mr. Hoover's call for the extra session and from his first message to Congress were the first evidence we had that we needed tariff legislation. I pointed out to the Senator the speech delivered in the campaign three weeks before the election in which Mr. Hoover laid great stress on the necessity of revising the tariff.

Mr. WHEELER. He made that speech at Boston, and I was—

Mr. BINGHAM. It was broadcasted all over the country; there was no concealing it.

Mr. WHEELER. And I was wondering if that was the reason he lost Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

Mr. BINGHAM. The Senator knows the reason for that, as well as I do.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, this extra session was called, as is perfectly well understood, under a promise given by the President of the United States during the late campaign when he was a candidate for that office. The Washington Star of October 27, 1928, tells of the promise referred to. I quote from it as follows:

Herbert Hoover announced to-day that if the Republican Party is returned to power he would call an extra session of Congress to deal with farm relief if adequate legislation should not be enacted at the coming session.

"The question of a special session of Congress after March 4 in the event of the return of the Republican Party has been under discussion for some time"—

That is quoted—
said a formal statement issued by the Republican presidential candidate.

"There are a number of questions, particularly agricultural relief, which urgently require solution and should not be delayed for a whole year. It is our most urgent economic problem. I should hope it can be dealt with at the regular session this fall and thus a special session avoided. If, however, that can not be accomplished I would, if elected, not allow the matter to drift, and would of necessity call an extra session so as to secure early constructive action."

It is likewise, Mr. President, quite generally understood that that pronouncement was made by the President of the United States at that time due to the persuasion of the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the author of the resolution now before the Senate. The newspaper article continues:

Senator BORAH discussed the farm problem during a luncheon conference with Hoover yesterday afternoon. There were indications that Hoover sent for BORAH with a view to obtaining his views upon the special-session proposal.

It was the depressed condition of agriculture, Mr. President, then, that was the occasion for the calling of this extra session, called, as has been stated, upon the suggestion of the Senator from Idaho. There was no other industry in the country at that time which seemed to be in such a situation as to call for immediate action by the Congress of the United States or whose claims could not be deferred until taken up in regular order at the general session. Indeed, Mr. President, at the very time that this pronouncement was put out the country was being told

that we were enjoying not only phenomenal but unexampled prosperity; but now on the floor of the Senate we are told to-day that not only was that not true but that there were many industries that were prostrate, including the blast-furnace business, spoken of by the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. REED], and the cement business, spoken of by other Senators; that they have been in that condition for several years past, and that the condition is so critical that it becomes necessary to take care of them at this special session of Congress. Accordingly, the House of Representatives has undertaken to take care of them (the farmers) in the bill which came to us a few days ago, in which the duty on brick, theretofore free, is fixed at \$1.25 a thousand; the duty on cement, theretofore free, is now fixed at 8 cents a hundredweight, or the equivalent of 30 cents a barrel; shingles, theretofore free, are to bear a duty of 25 per cent; cedar lumber, theretofore free, is to bear a duty of 25 per cent; maple and birch lumber, theretofore free, is to bear a duty of 15 per cent. Cabinet furniture, not generally understood to be an agricultural product or one immediately related to agriculture, theretofore bearing an ad valorem rate of 33 1/4 per cent, is raised to 40 per cent. Linen handkerchiefs, likewise not grown on the farm, theretofore bearing a duty of 45 per cent, are raised to 50 per cent; light bulbs, now used in farmhouses as well as in houses in the city, theretofore bearing a duty of 20 per cent, are now to bear a duty of 30 per cent. Building granite, scarcely to be classed as an agricultural product, theretofore bearing a duty of 50 per cent, is now increased to 60 per cent. Surgical instruments—surgical instruments, bear in mind—theretofore bearing a duty of 45 per cent, are raised to 70 per cent.

These are but samples of the increases that may be looked for with others to be added by the Senate, increasing the burden of the present tariff which the Research Bureau of the American Farm Bureau Federation states, costs the farmers of the United States upwards of \$300,000,000 annually.

Mr. President, as might be expected, these increases have raised a furor in the agricultural Northwest. Some time ago—perhaps a month or six weeks ago—a representative of the Farm Bureau Federation made a speech in the city of Pittsburgh, at the time when it was beginning to be noised about that the tariff bill would embrace articles other than commodities produced upon the farm. He went there apparently for the purpose of impressing upon those who were agitating that course the unwisdom of it, and he then declared, what must be admitted by all to be a sound economic principle, that if the duty be raised upon agricultural products and likewise raised upon commodities generally the tariff might as well be let alone, because whatever advantage should accrue to the farmer by reason of the increased duties upon his products would be overcome, as suggested here this afternoon by the Senator from Maryland, by the increased price that he would be obliged to pay for the other favored commodities.

I thought it was a bold thing on the part of this representative of the farming interests of the country to make such a speech as that in that citadel of protection, but obviously, so far as the House is concerned, a futile thing.

The opposition to this course, and the disappointment which it has provoked throughout the agricultural Northwest, is reflected in the attitude of the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, a stalwart Republican paper published in the very heart of an overwhelmingly Republican country. Its issue of June 5 carries a significant cartoon illustrating the farmer carrying the additional burdens which would be imposed upon him by the tariff bill as it came from the House; and, as has been repeatedly said here, with the Finance Committee of the Senate constituted as it is—the great majority of the members coming from the region east of the Mississippi, if not east of the Alleghany Mountains—it is vain to expect that any mitigation of the situation will result from any consideration given to the bill by the Senate Committee on Finance. That journal has been so wrought up by the situation as it presents itself to-day that it circulated in the Northwest country, and had signed, a telegram of protest by some 300 farm organizations representing some 300,000 individuals. It seems to me so important that I venture to read it:

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., June 3, 1929.

To the Hon. REED SMOOT,
Chairman Finance Committee,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

We business men and farmers of the agricultural Northwest had certain definite promises from the Republican Party and the Republican candidate for President last fall. In the present tariff bill, especially in regard to the proposed tariff on the farmer's building material and the lack of sufficient increases in the tariffs on what the farmer has to sell, we see a failure of the Republican Party to keep those promises so solemnly made.

We understand quite distinctly that the present special session of Congress was called primarily and exclusively to help the farmer. The tariff was to be amended in the interests of the farmer, yet we find what we consider wholly unjustifiable increases in the tariffs on the farmer's building material. The sum total of the farmer's trouble, as everyone knows, is the spread between the cost of that which he buys and the prices of that which he sells. Instead of narrowing this spread, the tariff on shingles, lumber, brick, and cement only increases it. The farmer is the country's chief user of shingles. Any increase in the cost of shingles will come largely out of the farmer's pocket. The farmer is a large user of cement. He uses cement in the construction of his farm buildings, for fence posts, and pays his share of the cost of cement roads.

The cement industry is one of the most highly organized in the country, and is organized chiefly in the interests of the industry. We can not understand that this industry needs help at the expense of the already distressed farmer.

With a due appreciation of the labors of your committee, we can not see how these proposed increases square with the campaign pledges of the Republican Party and of the President. We earnestly urge that all building material in which the farmer is chiefly interested be put on the free list. We also urge increases in duties on agricultural imports such as are advocated by the Northwest delegation in Congress. We feel that we have a right to ask this in good faith, in view of the promises made to us during the last campaign.

Signed by the Minneapolis Tribune, Frederick E. Murphy, publisher, in its own behalf, and in behalf of the following representative organizations and individuals of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, Montana, and Wisconsin.

The signers are headed by the Minnesota Farm Bureau Federation.

In the issue of the paper referred to is an editorial commenting on this telegram which I feel justified in reading. It is headed:

THE NORTHWEST IS TO BE CONGRATULATED

The Tribune wishes to thank the multitudinous citizens of the Northwest who appended their signatures to the mighty telegram now in the hands of Senator SMOOT. No less than 220 organizations were represented on the message; and in many instances the officers of the organizations had to call the members together and lay the project before them. In a world as busy as ours all this meant no inconsiderable inconvenience; yet the inconvenience was cheerfully ignored, and the response was as prompt and unequivocal as it was cordial. The mere fact that 220 organizations and individuals representing, in the aggregate, 300,000 Northwest citizens, could, on such short notice, be mobilized into an army actively defending the interests of the Northwest is most heartening. Here we have concrete evidence as to the kind of citizenship we have in the Northwest. Ours is clearly an alert, vigilant, aggressive, intelligent, and informed citizenry, ready, at a second's notice, to drop the day's work, and enlist in the service of the common cause. That is proof that we have a magnificent spirit in this part of the country, and that the Northwest is able, when the emergency arises, to shed petty differences, and present a solid and impressive front.

And make no mistake about it—that Gargantuan telegram will exert a profound effect upon the Senate. When 300,000 people speak with a single voice, Congress pauses and listens. Public opinion is, and always has been, democracy's sovereign; and a Congress knows that public opinion is invading Washington when a telegram representing the sentiments of 300,000 American citizens stalks into the Capitol. Congress may dismiss expressions of individuals or small groups as not representative of any considerable section of public opinion; but when 300,000 citizens from a far-flung area embracing six agrarian States set forth their views in a telegram, Congress knows that it is dealing with a tremendous force.

We have hopes that the huge group, so hastily assembled to sign the telegram, will not, of necessity, be demobilized—that is, in spirit. The Northwest's fight for the redemption of the Republican Party's pledges to the farmer is not yet won. A long battle lies ahead. The industrial East will continue fighting us throughout the summer. As the tariff bill now stands, agriculture has secured roughly 60 upward raises while industry has secured something in the neighborhood of 900. That is like nothing we heard in the campaign. We heard no speakers stumping the Northwest and speaking as follows:

"Come on, agriculture; vote for us, and we'll solemnly promise you that every time we give industry 15 upward tariff raises we'll give you one."

No; that wasn't what was said. We were told that agriculture was to be put on a plane of parity with industry as regards the tariff. Our impression was that this time industry would be left out in the cold while the agricultural schedules would be tilted upward until they struck an even balance with the industrial schedules. The industrial East is willing enough to give the farmer 1 raise every time it gets 15 for itself, but we can't see that that is such a good bargain for the farmer or that it is agricultural-industrial "parity" or that it is a fulfillment of the party pledges.

That is why we hope the Northwest citizens who so enthusiastically responded to our petition for signers will remain, so to speak, a reserve. There may be a necessity for the Northwest to assert itself forcibly again during the summer—possibly several times. We trust that these citizens, who already have demonstrated their loyalty to the Northwest, will regard themselves as part of a volunteer corps of defense, ready to spring to action if and when the occasion demands.

Meanwhile we congratulate our Northwest citizens upon their splendid morale. Their response exceeded our most extravagant expectations, and in its spontaneity, fervor, and epic dimensions this demonstration of loyalty to the Northwest was the finest thing of its kind that ever happened in our part of the world.

Now, Mr. President, I desire to recur to a statement made in the telegram, as follows:

The sum total of the farmer's trouble, as everyone knows, is the spread between the cost of that which he buys and the prices of that which he sells.

At the time we began consideration of the farm relief bill I asked of the Department of Agriculture information concerning what that spread at that time amounted to. The information came to me from the Economic Bureau of the Department of Agriculture that at that time the purchasing power of farm products as compared with the purchasing power they had for the 5-year period from 1909 to 1913, inclusive, was 73 per cent. In other words, the farmer can now buy only 73 per cent of the commodities that he could with the products of his labors during that 5-year period; and since then the price of wheat has gone down until I had a letter from Wolf Point the other day to the effect that on that day it was commanding a price of 64 cents a bushel in that market.

Mr. NORBECK. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. NORBECK. The ratio price of wheat as compared with the pre-war purchasing power would be \$1.50 a bushel, would it not?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I have forgotten just exactly what the figures are, but my recollection is that it should be something like \$1.40. That is to say, the prices of other commodities have risen to such an extent that in order to preserve the purchasing power of wheat it ought to be somewhere about \$1.40.

Mr. President, we spent a long time in dealing with that subject and we have this afternoon appropriated \$150,000,000 for the purpose of overcoming this spread between the price of what the farmer sells and what he buys; and now we propose to overcome whatever good will arise from that bill by increasing again the price of everything that he buys!

Mr. President, some reference was made here to the discourtesy that it is said would be shown to the House by the action contemplated by this resolution.

This special session, as I say, was called for the express purpose of giving relief to the farmer. It has been repeated again and again, and the truth can not be overlooked, that the problem of bringing the farmer's industry up to a level with other industries economically can not be solved by any single piece of legislation. Accordingly, on the 16th day of May the Senate passed unanimously a bill recommended unanimously by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, recommended by the Department of Agriculture; in fact, drafted by the Department of Agriculture, approved by the Budget, and specifically approved by the President of the United States, to promote the establishment of laboratories for the testing of protein in wheat, and for carrying on experiments and research for the purpose of determining how best to grow wheat containing protein in a high percentage, the conditions under which the protein content in wheat may be increased, and other information of that character. The bill went to the House. It lay upon the Speaker's desk for nine days, until the 25th day of May, when it was referred to the Committee on Agriculture, and there it sleeps. The House has not passed any resolution that it will not consider that bill during the current session of the Congress, but its conduct is just as expressive as though it did do so.

The Senate a week ago passed a bill fathered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] for the purpose of giving some further relief to farmers growing perishable products sent into interstate commerce. That bill has gone over to the House, and, so far as my information goes, it has been ignored in exactly the same way.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Montana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I do.

Mr. BORAH. I was informed by a Member of the House who is interested in the bill that the committee which will have charge of the bill declined to consider it at this session.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. My information concerning the protein bill is exactly to the same effect. I may say that I have been studiously endeavoring—I fear rather offensively endeavoring—to induce the Agricultural Committee over in the House to realize that the bill to which I first referred is a bill for farm relief. Indeed, Mr. President, I dare say I violate no confidence in saying that the President of the United States regards it as altogether important that the Farm Board should have the benefit of that bill in order that it may properly grade wheat going upon the market.

It was said here this afternoon by the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. NORBECK], who is thoroughly well informed upon these matters, that wheat carrying a duty of 42 cents a bushel might just as well be upon the free list. Of course, he referred to the wheat ordinarily grown in this country; and it is not contended by anyone who knows anything about the subject that the duty on wheat is effective in any regard except with respect to the high-grade protein wheat grown in Canada, with which the high-grade protein wheat raised in this country competes. So that in order to make the tariff on wheat effective we must have full information, and the means of securing full information concerning the protein content of wheat. I am informed that in exactly the same way the House does not consider that the exigencies of the case are such as to require action upon that matter at this special session, but that it does require action to increase the duty upon cement, upon lumber, upon furniture, upon maple boards, and these other commodities to which I have referred in my remarks here.

I do not consider it at all as an affront to the House to say to it that, in the judgment of the Senate, at this special session legislation ought to be confined to measures that have relation to the particular object for which the special session was called, namely, farm relief, and to act accordingly.

Mr. President, some reference was made here to-day to manganese, and some little risibility was excited by the statement made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. OGDEN] that the duty on manganese has direct reference to farm relief; that manganese is now used extensively as a fertilizing agent.

I was astonished to learn in Florida, when I visited that State some six weeks ago, that manganese is being extensively used there for the purpose of fertilizing lands devoted to the culture of tomatoes; whereupon I secured bulletins from the Department of Agriculture in which reference was made to fields fertilized by manganese and the results as compared with other fields that were not thus treated, and further information given showing the extraordinary results arrived at by the use of this new-found fertilizer.

Mr. President, I am subjected to all manner of importunities from my State, deeply interested in duties upon chrome and manganese, which the Senator from Pennsylvania says we can not have because that would increase the cost of producing steel, to oppose this resolution; but I am unwilling at this special session to support a proposal to go into a general revision of the tariff, which I can anticipate would mean nothing less than the imposition of enormous additional burdens upon the farmers of this country, in order to get a duty upon chrome and manganese, however important they may be to our State, and they are vastly important, because our State promises to become the great producer of those commodities. I am perfectly content to allow that matter to await action at a general session of the Congress, seeing that we waited for adequate encouragement of that character during all these years.

I hope the resolution of the Senator from Idaho will be adopted.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll. The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Dill	Hayden	Overman
Barkley	Edge	Hebert	Patterson
Bingham	Fess	Heflin	Pine
Blease	Fletcher	Howell	Ransdell
Borah	Frazier	Johnson	Reed
Bratton	George	Jones	Robinson, Ark.
Brookhart	Gillett	Kean	Robinson, Ind.
Broussard	Glass	King	Sackett
Burton	Glenn	La Follette	Schall
Capper	Goff	McKellar	Sheppard
Caraway	Goldsborough	McNary	Shortridge
Connally	Greene	Metcalf	Simmons
Copeland	Harris	Moses	Smith
Couzens	Harrison	Norbeck	Smoot
Cutting	Hastings	Norris	Steck
Dale	Hatfield	Nye	Stewer
Deneen	Hawes	Oddie	Swanson

Thomas, Idaho	Trammell	Vandenberg	Waterman
Thomas, Okla.	Tydings	Walsh, Mont.	Watson
Townsend	Tyson	Warren	Wheeler

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. BLAINE]. I ask that the announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. SCHALL. My colleague [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. BLACK] is absent on account of illness.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] to the resolution offered by the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH].

Mr. WATSON. I was about to move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock. I had been informed that three or four Senators wanted to speak, but they have just notified me that if we may have a vote now they will not speak.

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I do not wish to make any speech, but I want to make perfectly plain the reason for the vote I am about to cast.

I do not wish to see the resolution of the Senator from Idaho defeated by indirection. He is entitled to a straight vote on his resolution. Therefore I shall vote against the amendment offered by the Senator from Washington, although I shall not vote for the resolution of the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I shall detain the Senate just a few minutes. I would have spoken before, but I did not know a quorum would be developed so quickly. I am not going to say what I had intended to say, but I want to say just a few words as to what led me to offer the amendment which I have presented.

Much has been said with reference to the President's attitude. I think the best way to judge of his attitude is to read what he said in the special message calling the Congress together. I think that correctly states his attitude. In the very first sentence of his special message to Congress he said:

I have called this special session of Congress to redeem two pledges given in the last election—farm relief and limited changes in the tariff.

Again, in the same message he said, often discussing farm relief, in discussing the tariff, although I will not read all of it:

It would seem to me that the test of necessity for revision is in the main whether there has been a substantial slackening of activity in an industry during the past few years, and a consequent decrease of employment due to insurmountable competition in the products of that industry.

Mr. President, the amendment I have proposed adds to the proposal of the Senator from Idaho the following:

And any other line of industry in which there is and has been during the past few years a substantial slackening of activity, with a consequent decrease of employment, due to insurmountable competition from imports of the products of such industry.

This, as nearly as I could frame the amendment, covers the language and the attitude of the President of the United States, and I think it covers his attitude pretty generally.

I want to say that I am very much in accord with the ideas of the Senator from Idaho with reference to tariff revision at this session of the Congress. I do not believe we should go farther than the President suggests in his message. I think the first and prime consideration is the relief of agriculture through the tariff, that the other is really subordinate. But the President recognizes that there are some particular industries or particular lines of industry which are in a bad way. It is only through the tariff that they can get relief. So that is incorporated in his message, and that, I think, is what Congress should follow.

I think the country is generally prosperous, and I want to read something, which can not be classed as political, from a document which I just got hold of the other day, ran across by accident, really. It comes, I think, to every Senator, probably every month, or at certain stated times. It is a statement by the National City Bank of New York as to economic conditions, Government business, and United States securities. This is for June, 1929. I think I shall read a brief extract from it. It can not be classed as partisan or political.

Trade and industry during the month of May have held close to the high level of previous months and the seasonal recession has been distinctly less than usual. Measured in terms both of volume and profits business is making an outstanding record, and one that is all the more impressive by reason of the unfavorable money conditions with which it has had to contend.

Factory employment, according to the Department of Labor, has increased rapidly this spring and is running 6 per cent ahead of last year, with pay rolls averaging 11 per cent higher. Of 23 major classifications of industry reported by the department only 4—leather, fertilizer, lumber, and stone, clay and glass products—show a reduction of working forces, marked gains appearing in iron and steel, automotive, agriculture implement, nonferrous metal, and machine tool lines. Consumption of electric power in industry is reported 14 per cent ahead of last year, while railway carloading of revenue freight is exceeding all previous records, the gain for the week of May 18 being 4.2 per cent as compared with the corresponding week of 1928, and 1.8 per cent compared with 1927.

In the steel industry blast furnaces and rolling mill operations are holding close to capacity, and production during the first four months was 11 per cent ahead of last year and at the unprecedented rate of 56,000,000 tons annually. Despite this record production, there is said to be enough forward orders on the books to carry the mills well into the summer and to minimize the usual slowing down. Unfilled orders of the United States Steel Corporation are the largest in over three years, and earnings of the steel industry for the second quarter doubtless are in line with the excellent results achieved in the first.

The unusual momentum of steel production and demand is a source of surprise to both buyers and sellers, and the explanation seems to be the large increase in automobile demand this year, which is believed to account for perhaps three-fourths of the gain in steel production. Five years ago the motor industry used approximately 10 per cent of the country's steel output; last year it used 18 per cent, and this year it is using 23 per cent.

Monthly production of automobiles continues at a rate far in excess of any previous year, notwithstanding which conditions in the industry are reported sound, with car stocks generally normal, owing to good retail distribution and rapidly expanding exports. It is conceded that manufacturing schedules doubtless will have to be cut later in the year, but as manufacturers are watching the market closely the industry feels confident that overproduction will be avoided.

All in all the business situation of the moment appears exceptionally favorable, with production in most lines well adjusted to demand, with a high consumer purchasing power, low inventories, and a generally stable price level. It is a pity under these circumstances that a condition of credit has developed which is creating uncertainty and which, if it continues, can scarcely fail to affect business adversely.

Mr. President, it seems to me, in the face of a general statement like that with reference to general prosperity throughout the country, that a general revision of the tariff is unjustified, is unwarranted, and that the action recommended by the President is as far as we should go. In my amendment as I offered it yesterday I referred, not by name, to industries peculiarly depressed. There was some amusement, apparently, in the minds of some who supposed that I was referring to shingles. I had shingles in mind. I had something else in mind also, however. I had in mind the textile industry, which I have heard of for some time as being in such distress. I remember that the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM] stated to me several times that particular lines of the textile industry in his State are being threatened with destruction by the importation of certain classes of goods from Germany with which our people can not compete. I do not know how many other conditions there may be like it.

I want to say just a word or two about the shingle industry in my State.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question before he proceeds to discuss shingles?

Mr. JONES. I yield to the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. EDGE. In view of the fact that the Senator has read from the statement just now, I assume that he would include as under the purview of his resolution, quoting from the article as an illustration, in addition to lumber, leather, fertilizers, stone, and clay and glass products, as having shown a falling off during the time covered by the report.

Mr. JONES. But there did not appear to be a very serious falling off.

Mr. EDGE. But using that as the Senator did as an illustration, does the Senator believe, if his amendment is adopted, that the Finance Committee should investigate glass and stone-ware? I happen to be chairman of the subcommittee to which that subject has been referred. Does the Senator believe the subcommittee would be justified in hearing the representatives of those industries in order to know whether they would come under the terms of the Senator's amendment?

Mr. JONES. I think the committee would be justified, because the idea would be that the committee would get the facts upon which it would base its decision as to whether or not the conditions came under the terms of the resolution. The committee, of course, would have to ascertain the facts before

it could be determined, but language of this kind would be in the nature of an instruction to the committee that unless it found from the facts that such was the condition, then it should not report tariff increases for such industry.

Mr. President, I am not going to discuss the shingle industry at any length, but I want to call attention briefly to the situation. We have some 15,000 or 20,000 people employed in the shingle industry in our State. It is true the industry is not existent all over the country. Heretofore we have been producing about two-thirds of all the shingles used in the United States, but by reason of competition from an adjoining country that business is going and has been going increasingly to another country instead of to our own people, and our mills have been closing. Bankruptcy has been brought to many of them and is faced by many more. If the policy of protection to American industry is good for one industry in this country, it should be applied to other industries of the country. I know that the shingle industry is not as widespread as agriculture, but has it come to the point where we are going to grant protective duties only to industries that are coextensive with the country? I do not think so.

In my State the prosperity of the shingle industry means a great deal to the farming people of my State. With 15,000 or 20,000 people employed in the shingle mills of the State of Washington furnishing a market for the farm production of our State, it can not be jeered at or laughed at or cast aside lightly. Our farmers, the agriculturists of our State, are interested and vitally interested in the prosperity of the shingle industry. Are we going to disregard the agricultural interests of the State of Washington along with the shingle interests and industry of that State? If we continue any longer to keep shingles on the free list, the shingle industry will be gone. There have been fifteen or twenty thousand people employed, but they are growing less in number every year. The mills are going out of business and the employees are going into something else and the agriculturists of our State will lose that market.

Mr. President, we must not overlook the fact that this bill has come to us from the House of Representatives. The items covered by it may not be what we would like. The action of the House may be broader than we would like. But it seems to me that the only way we can properly and wisely deal with it is by having our committee consider the matter and acquaint themselves with the conditions, take the results that the Senate may place in the hands of our conference committee, and, with the action of the Senate and with the information that the committee has acquired out of the hearings, it can deal with the question properly in conference. But if we take it away from the committee and do not allow them to acquaint themselves with the facts and conditions of the various matters in controversy, then it seems to me our conference committee will be at a decided disadvantage in conference. I hope that from the conference will come a bill in line with the President's message to deal primarily with agriculture and then with those lines of industry which show essential depression, but it seems to me that the wise way is to give our committee the opportunity to investigate and determine the facts and get all the information possible, so as to enable them and us to discuss and decide the question in a proper manner with the House conferees.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I would much prefer to pass on the tariff bill in the open Senate item by item than to have some sort of measure passed through here for the moment under an uncertain and confusing resolution like this, referred to the conference committee representing the two Houses, and then have the conferees write "a general tariff bill" which would then be reported back to the Senate. I want the Senate to pass on the bill when we will have ample time and opportunity day after day to discuss and vote on the items that go into the bill. I want the opportunity right here in the Senate to fight to cut down rates that I think are too high and I want the opportunity right here in the Senate to increase the tariff rates for the farmer that I think are too low.

Mr. President, in the United States of America, southward the star of industry takes its way. Many of the textile industries of New England cotton spinners are moving down into that glorious section of our country. I bid them welcome and I want them to know that their manufactured cotton products will be properly cared for and protected in the sunny land of Dixie.

The South will not permit them to suffer from ruinous competition with the pauper labor and cheap manufacturing concerns of Europe. We had just as well speak plainly on that subject now, and as a southern Democrat I gladly make that announcement. It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us. I favor a tariff tax or import duty against the cotton that is now coming into our country from foreign coun-

tries at the rate of 500,000 or 600,000 bales a year in competition with cotton produced in the United States.

I want certain other farm products of the South taken care of in the tariff bill that is going to be passed at this session of Congress. We are confronted with a very unsatisfactory situation on the pending Borah resolution. It is puzzling and confusing to some of us. The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] says that textiles are not related to farm products and could not therefore be considered if his resolution is passed. That would be unfair and unjust to the cotton producer and cotton spinner. The farmer comes to market in my town and sells a bale of cotton to the spinner in my county and, Mr. President, we have more cotton spindles under one roof in my county than in any other county in the South. The spinner buys that bale of cotton from a farmer and spins it into cloth. The merchant in the agricultural section takes it into his store and sells it back to the same people, perhaps, in the same county, but because that farm product has been spun by a textile industry or cotton mill into cloth, it is not, according to the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] even close enough akin to a farm product—think of it—to be given fair treatment, safeguarded, and protected in a tariff bill at this session of Congress if this resolution is adopted.

Then the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] says that he thinks it would be entitled to consideration. Now, there are two distinguished leaders—one a Republican and one a Democrat, both for the resolution—at loggerheads on that subject. They can not agree on this matter which vitally affects the whole cotton industry of the South. So far as I am concerned, I prefer to let whatever we do here for or against the farmer be in the "open Senate" in a general bill, because I want to tell the friends of agriculture in this body that they are not going to be permitted to pass any agricultural tariff bill by itself that will give any benefit to the farmer. We saw what happened to the debenture plan. We provided for debentures on a bill that pertained purely and wholly, singly and solely to the farmer, on a farm relief bill, and we saw a surgical operation performed on the bill—a major operation—in the House at the other end of the Capitol. They took the tariff debenture plan out of the measure entirely; a provision which would have benefited the cotton farmers of my State \$10 a bale and the wheat growers of the West 21 cents a bushel was eliminated. Why? Because it was purely a farm relief bill. I am trying to convey to you the practical sense of the situation that confronts us.

Now, if the Senate should strip the tariff bill of every provision except those affecting agriculture it would have just as much chance to pass through both branches of Congress and reach the President as a snowball would have to last indefinitely down yonder in that hot region in which Pluto dwells. [Laughter.]

They would defeat and kill outright any measure that gave the benefit of a protective tariff solely to the farmers. I think we all know that, and then they would pass a tariff bill that would leave the farmer out entirely. The only hope we have is to put whatever legislation for the benefit of the farmer we propose to pass at this extra session of Congress into a general tariff bill. I think most Senators know that. Our only hope to get a fair deal for the farmer in a tariff bill is in the open Senate.

If those here who claim to be the friend of the farmer will join with me and others from the South, we can benefit the farmer by increasing the rates on his products that should be increased and by holding down the rates in the tariff schedules that are hard, oppressive, and indefensible on the people generally.

One other suggestion, and then I am through. The House of Representatives has the right under the Constitution to originate revenue measures—tariff measures. It has originated one at this session and passed it, and it is said to be a monstrous piece of tariff legislation, but we have the right to go through it, to cut it down, and to change it altogether. But what are we proposing to do under the Borah resolution? We are about to lay out a plan and tell the House that we are going to consider a certain phase of the tariff bill and no other; that the House can take that and pass it or go home. Well, that is not the way to handle the matter. I would offer a substitute resolution, except for my desire to permit Senators to have a vote on the Borah resolution, to instruct the Finance Committee of the Senate to confer with the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives to see if it is possible to agree on a program to limit our activities on tariff legislation at this session of Congress to the matters set out in the Borah resolution. Do that and if both Houses of Congress agree to that program I will fight all the way down the line for that program. But the House will not agree to it and you know it. So the

Borah resolution does not in any way solve our distressing problem.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, in order that there may be no misunderstanding about how my vote shall be interpreted I want to say that the subcommittee on Schedule 4, dealing with wood and manufactures of wood, had a 6-hour session to-day. I am heartily in favor of the amendment to the pending resolution proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES]. It seems to me by every kind of interpretation that that amendment would carry out the purpose for which the extra session was called. In voting for the Jones amendment, however, I wish it to be understood that I approve of that amendment only, and in no way may my vote be interpreted as a vote in favor of the House bill. I am in entire disagreement with many of the items in that bill, but I do not conceive how any possible action on many parts of that bill can be had without proper hearings by the Finance Committee. So far as I am concerned, if the Borah resolution shall be adopted there will be no more hearings on Schedule 4. A hearing on that schedule is set for 9.30 o'clock to-morrow morning, but should the Borah resolution be agreed to there will be no continued hearings on it in spite of the fact that there are many provisions of the House bill which deal with Schedule 4. I want it understood that a vote for the Jones amendment by me is not in any sense a vote for the House bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment to the pending resolution proposed by the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES].

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I do not desire to delay a vote on the amendment to the resolution, but I simply wish to say that, in my opinion, the adoption of the Jones amendment would utterly destroy the effect of the proposal to limit the revision of the tariff in accordance with the resolution which I have submitted.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, in view of the remarks just made by the Senator from Idaho, I desire to say that if the Jones amendment to the resolution shall not be adopted, I shall vote against the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT and others called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN (when his name was called). On the pending resolution I have a special pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WILCOTT]. Not knowing how the junior Senator from Connecticut would vote upon the Jones amendment, I withhold my vote.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. BLAINE's name was called). I wish to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. BLAINE] has a general pair with the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. GOULD]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I have been unable to obtain a transfer of that pair. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "nay," and I am advised that the Senator from Colorado, if present, would vote "yea" on this question.

Mr. FESS (when Mr. KEYES's name was called). On this vote the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] is paired with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present, he would vote "yea," and the Senator from Minnesota, if present, would vote "nay."

Mr. NORBECK (when Mr. McMASTER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. If the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER] were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ODDIE (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with my colleague the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], who has just left for Nevada. If he were present, he would vote "nay." If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], who is detained from the Senate on account of illness in his family. I therefore withhold my vote. If I were permitted to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK]. If the Senator from Maine were present, he would vote "yea," and if the Senator from Alabama were present he would vote "nay." I vote "nay."

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily detained from the Chamber. If he were present, I understand he would vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—38			
Bingham	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Broussard	Goff	Metcalf	Townsend
Burton	Goldsborough	Moses	Trammell
Couzens	Greene	Patterson	Vandenberg
Dale	Hastings	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Deneen	Hatfield	Reed	Warren
Dill	Hebert	Sackett	Waterman
Edge	Heflin	Shortridge	Watson
Fess	Jones	Smoot	
Gillett	Kean	Steck	
NAYS—39			
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Simmons
Blease	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Borah	Glass	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Harrison	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	Hawes	Overman	Tydings
Caraway	Hayden	Pine	Tyson
Connally	Howell	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mont.
Copeland	Johnson	Schall	Wheeler
Cutting	King	Sheppard	
NOT VOTING—18			
Allen	Gould	Oddie	Stephens
Ashurst	Hale	Phipps	Wagner
Black	Kendrick	Pittman	Walcott
Blaine	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
George	McMaster	Shipstead	

So the amendment of Mr. JONES was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the adoption of the resolution submitted by the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. BORAH, Mr. McKELLAR, and others called for the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ALLEN (when his name was called). On this question I have a pair with the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. WALCOTT]. If he were present he would vote "nay," and if I were permitted to vote I should vote "yea."

Mr. LA FOLLETTE (when Mr. BLAINE's name was called). Making the same announcement as before concerning the pair of my colleague [Mr. BLAINE], I wish to state if he were present he would vote "yea."

Mr. NORBECK (when Mr. McMASTER's name was called). My colleague [Mr. McMASTER] is unavoidably absent from the city. He is paired with the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. KENDRICK]. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea." If the Senator from Wyoming were present, he would vote "nay."

Mr. ODDIE (when his name was called). I am paired with my colleague [Mr. PITTMAN] and withhold my vote. If my colleague were present, he would vote "yea," and if I were at liberty to vote I should vote "nay."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS] and therefore withhold my vote. If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] and vote "yea." I desire to state that if the junior Senator from Alabama were present he would vote "yea," and if the senior Senator from Maine were present he would vote "nay."

Mr. COPELAND (when Mr. WAGNER's name was called). Making the same announcement as before relative to the absence of my colleague [Mr. WAGNER], I wish to announce that if he were present he would vote "nay."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEORGE. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I have been unable to obtain a transfer of that pair. I am advised that if the Senator from Colorado were present he would vote "nay." If I were at liberty to vote, I should vote "yea."

Mr. JONES. I desire to announce that the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] has a pair on this question with the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD]. If the Senator from New Hampshire were present, he would vote "nay," and if the Senator from Minnesota were present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 39, as follows:

YEAS—38			
Barkley	Bratton	Caraway	Cutting
Blease	Brookhart	Connally	Fletcher
Borah	Capper	Copeland	Frazier

Glass	La Follette	Robinson, Ark.	Thomas, Okla.
Harris	McKellar	Schall	Tydings
Harrison	Norbeck	Sheppard	Tyson
Hawes	Norris	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Hayden	Nye	Smith	Wheeler
Howell	Overman	Swanson	
King	Pine	Thomas, Idaho	

NAYS—39			
Bingham	Glenn	Kean	Steck
Broussard	Goff	McNary	Steiwer
Burton	Goldsborough	Metcalf	Townsend
Couzens	Greene	Moses	Trammell
Dale	Hastings	Patterson	Vandenberg
Deneen	Hatfield	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Dill	Hebert	Reed	Warren
Edge	Heflin	Sackett	Waterman
Fess	Johnson	Shortridge	Watson
Gillett	Jones	Smoot	

NOT VOTING—18			
Allen	Gould	Oddie	Stephens
Ashurst	Hale	Phipps	Wagner
Black	Kendrick	Pittman	Walcott
Blaine	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	
George	McMaster	Shipstead	

So Mr. BORAH's resolution was rejected.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Chaffee, one of its clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15) providing for the printing of 1,000 additional copies of the consolidated hearings held before the committee relative to "Tariff act of 1929."

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills and joint resolution, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 3966. An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government;

H. R. 4016. An act making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929; and

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to begin October 5, 1929.

HOUSE BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION REFERRED

The following bills and joint resolution were severally read twice by their titles and referred as indicated below:

H. R. 3966. An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government; to the calendar.

H. R. 4016. An act making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the "Agricultural marketing act," approved June 15, 1929; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. J. Res. 109. Joint resolution authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to begin October 5, 1929; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SUMMER ADJOURNMENT

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I submit a privileged concurrent resolution, which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be stated.

The Chief Clerk read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16), as follows:

Resolved, etc., That when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, June 19, 1929, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, August 19, 1929.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. WATSON. My understanding is that this is a privileged motion and not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable; but does the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. WATSON. I yield for a question.

Mr. BORAH. I did not catch the language of the resolution which the Senator offered.

Mr. WATSON. Let it be stated again.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will restate the resolution.

The CHIEF CLERK. Concurrent resolution:

Resolved, etc., That when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, June 19, 1929, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, August 19, 1929.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I make the point of order against the resolution that it is contrary to the Constitution of the United States, which says that neither body of Congress shall adjourn longer than three days without the consent of the other body.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is a concurrent resolution.

Mr. NORRIS. As the Secretary read it, he said "that when the Senate adjourns, * * * it stand adjourned" until a certain day in August.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Secretary restate the first part of it?

The CHIEF CLERK. Concurrent resolution:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring)—

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I desire to make a motion to amend. That will be in order anyway.

Mr. WATSON. That is in order.

Mr. NORRIS. If the Senator from Indiana says it is in order, that settles it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WATSON. I say so.

Mr. NORRIS. I move to strike out the words "August 19" and insert "September 16."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, is that a debatable proposition?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not.

Mr. BORAH. A motion of this nature is not debatable?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is not debatable.

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. President, I move to amend the amendment by changing the date to September 3.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, I accept the amendment of the Senator from Connecticut.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Nebraska modifies his amendment.

Mr. NORRIS. Yes; I will accept the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I do not accept it.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. President, I move to lay both of those motions on the table.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on laying the resolution on the table.

Mr. MOSES. The resolution, or the amendment?

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Virginia will state it.

Mr. GLASS. I desire to know, if that motion prevails, if it does not carry the whole thing to the table?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It does.

Mr. HEFLIN. I did not want to do that, Mr. President. I do not think we ought to recess for more than six weeks.

Mr. COUZENS. Mr. President, a point of order. A motion to lay on the table is not debatable.

Mr. HEFLIN. I withdraw my motion.

Mr. BORAH. I ask for the yeas and nays upon the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are demanded. Is the demand seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. DILL. Mr. President, what is the question?

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry? Are we voting on the amendment, or—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], as modified by the suggestion of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BINGHAM], making the date September 3. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as before, I withhold my vote. If at liberty to vote, I should vote "nay."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE]. Not knowing how he would vote on this question, I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. GEORGE. I have a pair with the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS]. I am advised that if present he would vote as I expect to vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 35, nays 44, as follows:

YEAS—35

Barkley	Frazier	McNary	Schall
Blease	Glass	Norbeck	Shortridge
Bratton	Harris	Norris	Smith
Brookhart	Hawes	Nye	Smoot
Burton	Hayden	Oddie	Steck
Copeland	Howell	Overman	Stelwer
Couzens	Johnson	Patterson	Tydings
Cutting	King	Reed	Walsh, Mont.
Dill	La Follette	Sackett	

NAYS—44

Allen	Fletcher	Heflin	Thomas, Idaho
Bingham	George	Jones	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Gillett	Kean	Townsend
Broussard	Glenn	McKellar	Trammell
Capper	Goff	Metcalf	Tyson
Caraway	Goldsborough	Moses	Vandenberg
Connally	Greene	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Dale	Harrison	Ransdell	Warren
Deneen	Hastings	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Edge	Hatfield	Sheppard	Watson
Fess	Hebert	Simmons	Wheeler

NOT VOTING—16

Ashurst	Hale	Phipps	Stephens
Black	Kendrick	Pittman	Swanson
Blaine	Keyes	Robinson, Ind.	Wagner
Gould	McMaster	Shipstead	Walcott

So Mr. NORRIS's amendment as modified was rejected.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I move to amend by inserting at the proper place the date of September 10, and on that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. What is the amendment?

Mr. TYDINGS. To make the date September 10.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will state the amendment.

The CHIEF CLERK. To strike out "August 19, 1929," and insert in lieu thereof "September 10, 1929."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] has demanded the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were not ordered.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the concurrent resolution.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. GEORGE (when his name was called). Making the same announcement of my pair, I am advised that the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], if present, would vote as I expect to vote, and I therefore vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (when his name was called). Making the same announcement as to my pair as on the previous vote, I am informed that the junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STEPHENS], if present, would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. SWANSON (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], but I understand that if present he would vote as I shall vote, and therefore I vote. I vote "yea."

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. KING. I have a general pair upon this vote with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. McMASTER], and, in his absence, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HEFLIN. My colleague [Mr. BLACK] is absent on account of illness. If he were present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 23, as follows:

YEAS—57

Allen	George	Kean	Shortridge
Bingham	Gillett	McKellar	Smoot
Blease	Glass	McNary	Steck
Bratton	Glenn	Metcalf	Stelwer
Broussard	Goff	Moses	Swanson
Burton	Goldsborough	Oddie	Townsend
Capper	Greene	Overman	Vandenberg
Connally	Harris	Patterson	Walsh, Mass.
Copeland	Harrison	Ransdell	Walsh, Mont.
Couzens	Hastings	Reed	Warren
Dale	Hatfield	Robinson, Ark.	Waterman
Deneen	Hayden	Robinson, Ind.	Watson
Dill	Hebert	Sackett	
Edge	Heflin	Schall	
Fess	Howell	Sheppard	

NAYS—23

Barkley	Frazier	Norris	Thomas, Okla.
Borah	Hawes	Nye	Trammell
Brookhart	Johnson	Pine	Tydings
Caraway	Jones	Simmons	Tyson
Cutting	La Follette	Smith	Wheeler
Fletcher	Norbeck	Thomas, Idaho	

NOT VOTING—15

Ashurst	Hale	McMaster	Stephens
Black	Kendrick	Phipps	Wagner
Blaine	Keyes	Pittman	Walcott
Gould	King	Shipstead	

So the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 16) was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That when the Senate adjourns on Wednesday, June 19, 1929, it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Monday, August 19, 1929.

SURVEY OF ESCAMBIA RIVER AND TRIBUTARIES

Mr. FLETCHER. I report back favorably, without amendment, from the Committee on Commerce the bill (H. R. 3671)

to authorize and direct a survey to be made of the Escambia River and its tributaries, Alabama and Florida.

I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made of the Escambia River and its tributaries, Alabama and Florida, with a view to the control of floods in accordance with the provisions of section 3 of an act entitled, "An act to provide for control of the floods of the Mississippi River, and of the Sacramento River, Calif., and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1917, the cost thereof to be paid from appropriations heretofore or hereafter made for such purposes.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FEDERAL FARM RELIEF FUND

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, from the Committee on Appropriations I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 4016) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929. The bill makes an appropriation of \$151,500,000 for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the bill which we recently passed providing for relief of agriculture in the United States. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, I understand this bill carries \$1,500,000 for administrative purposes under the farm relief act?

Mr. WARREN. Yes; \$1,500,000 is for administrative purposes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. And \$150,000,000 for a revolving fund under the provisions of the farm relief act recently passed by Congress?

Mr. WARREN. The bill provides for the appropriations the Senator suggests.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled the "Agricultural marketing act," approved June 15, 1929, including all necessary expenditures authorized therein, the sum of \$151,500,000, to be immediately available, of which amount \$150,000,000 shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered by the Federal Farm Board as provided in such act, and \$1,500,000 shall be available until June 30, 1930, for administrative expenses in executing the functions vested in the Federal Farm Board by such act.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask that the letter from President Hoover and the letter from the Acting Director of the Budget, which I send to the desk, may be printed in the RECORD.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letters presented by the Senator from Wyoming will be printed in the RECORD.

The letters referred to are as follows:

JUNE 15, 1929.

The SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Sir: I have the honor to transmit herewith for the consideration of Congress an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Farm Board for \$151,500,000, to be immediately available, for commencing operations under the provisions of the act entitled the "Agricultural marketing act," approved June 15, 1929.

This estimate provides \$150,000,000 of the \$500,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by the act as a revolving fund for use in making loans or advances, and the amount of \$1,500,000 authorized for the administrative expenses of the Federal Farm Board until June 30, 1930.

The details of this estimate, the necessity therefor, and the reason for its submission at this time are set forth in the letter of the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget, which is transmitted herewith and with which I concur.

I should add that the additional amounts which will be needed by the board can not be determined except by the board itself, but as Congress might shortly recess I have thought it desirable that a preliminary sum should be provided. If the board finds it necessary to have

further funds, it should be possible to make provision for them in ample time, as Congress will no doubt be in session by the time they are required.

Respectfully,

HERBERT HOOVER.

JUNE 15, 1929.

The PRESIDENT.

Sir: I have the honor to submit herewith for your consideration an estimate of appropriation for the Federal Farm Board for \$151,500,000 to be immediately available, of which amount \$150,000,000 is for a revolving fund to be administered by the board, and \$1,500,000 is for administrative expenses of the board until June 30, 1930, as follows:

"For carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled the 'Agricultural marketing act,' approved June 15, 1929, including all necessary expenditures therein authorized, to be immediately available, \$151,500,000, of which amount \$150,000,000 shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered by the Federal Farm Board as provided in said act, and \$1,500,000 shall be available until June 30, 1930, for administrative expenses in executing the functions vested in the Federal Farm Board by said act, \$151,500,000."

This estimate covers \$150,000,000 of the \$500,000,000 authorized to be appropriated by the act as a revolving fund for use in making loans or advances, and the full amount of \$1,500,000 authorized for the administrative expenses of the Federal Farm Board until June 30, 1930. The purpose of the estimate is to provide immediately sufficient funds to enable the board to commence operations under the act.

The foregoing estimate of appropriation is to meet legislation which has been enacted since the transmission of the Budget for 1930, and its approval is recommended.

Very respectfully,

R. O. KLOEBER,

Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

OPEN EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

Mr. JONES. I ask that the unfinished business be laid before the Senate.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 19) submitted by Mr. JONES, May 6, 1929, to amend paragraph 2 of Rule XXXVIII, relating to proceedings on nominations in executive session.

RECESS

Mr. WATSON. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate (at 5 o'clock and 55 minutes p. m.) took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1929, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, June 17, 1929

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Blessed Father in Heaven, be with us to-day. Give us the vision that lends glory to common tasks and that sheds splendor on obscure talents. Let Thy Spirit stir mysterious aspiration in all. Crown us with a new power coming from beyond ourselves; then shall we have real and lasting weight of character. Expel from our breasts every thought of hate, envy, strife, covetousness, and vulgarity. Cause love, joy, and peace to grow and blossom in all our lives. Bless us with the consciousness of right doing and right living. These are of eternal value, for they that thus do Thy will shall shine as the brightness of the firmament and shall be crowned with everlasting honor. Through Christ our Savior. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on June 14, 1929, present to the President, for his approval, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 1. An act to establish a Federal Farm Board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries, who informed the House that on the following dates the Presi-

dent approved and signed bills of the House of the following titles:

On June 6, 1929:

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution making appropriations for additional compensation for transportation of the mail by railroad routes in accordance with the increased rates fixed by the Interstate Commerce Commission.

On June 7, 1929:

H. J. Res. 61. Joint resolution to amend the appropriation "Organizing the Naval Reserve, 1930."

On June 11, 1929:

H. R. 3083. An act to amend subsection (a) of section 26 of the trading with the enemy act, as amended by the settlement of war claims act of 1928, so as to authorize the allocation of the unallocated interest fund in accordance with the records of the Alien Property Custodian.

On June 12, 1929:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution to provide for the payment of certain expenses of the United States Pulaski Sesquicentennial Commission;

H. R. 3663. An act making appropriations for the payment of certain judgments rendered against the Government by various United States courts; and

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution making an appropriation for the International Red Cross and Prisoners of War Conference at Geneva, Switzerland, in 1929.

On June 13, 1929:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to make available funds for carrying into effect the public resolution of February 20, 1929, as amended, concerning the cessions of certain islands of the Samoan group to the United States;

H. J. Res. 93. Joint resolution amending an appropriation for a consolidated school at Belcourt, within the Turtle Mountain Indian Reservation, N. Dak.; and

H. R. 3548. An act to continue, during the fiscal year 1930, Federal aid in rehabilitating farm lands in the areas devastated by floods in 1927.

On June 14, 1929:

H. R. 3600. An act to amend section 5 of an act entitled "An act authorizing Maynard D. Smith, his heirs, successors, and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the St. Clair River at or near Port Huron, Mich.," approved March 2, 1929, and being Public Act No. 923 of the Seventieth Congress;

H. J. Res. 73. Joint resolution to amend the act entitled "An act to incorporate the American Hospital of Paris," approved January 30, 1913; and

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for the extension to the post-office building at Corinth, Miss.

On June 15, 1929:

H. R. 1. An act to establish a Federal Farm Board to promote the effective merchandising of agricultural commodities in interstate and foreign commerce, and to place agriculture on a basis of economic equality with other industries; and

H. J. Res. 97. Joint resolution making appropriations toward carrying out the provisions of the act entitled "An act to provide for the establishment of a municipal center in the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1929.

On June 17, 1929:

H. R. 1648. An act to amend section 5 of the second Liberty bond act, as amended.

MUSCLE SHOALS

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech I made over the radio.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with leave granted me to extend my remarks I submit herewith a speech recently delivered by me over the radio from Washington, touching farm relief and the disposition of Muscle Shoals.

The address is as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, Congress is now in extra session for the declared purpose of granting farm relief. The President has shown by his letter to Senator McNARY opposing the debenture plan that he is against any legislation that will raise the price of farm products. The privileges of government under our present laws are practically all given to other industry, and many of them at the expense of agriculture; and this has brought about the farmers' principal troubles. But the President's first interest politically is to protect industries in these law-given privileges, and he is determined that they shall not be divided with agriculture.

So we must look elsewhere under this administration for any relief to farming than to the privilege of advancing prices. That privilege is reserved for industry only under the President's decree. The so-called farm relief bill which has passed the House recently was guarded by rules in its consideration which made it impossible to offer as amendment a plan that would increase the price of farm products, or grant the power to do so.

But there is a possibility of benefit in it if administered by a friendly board. That possibility lies in the way of moving closer together the farmer and the consumer of his product. In round numbers, the farmer receives seven and one-half billions of dollars for the food crop he raises each year. The consumer pays for that crop, delivered to his kitchen, twenty-two and one-half billions. I know there is a vast legitimate charge for processing and transportation to be counted, but it can be easily shown that all this could be met and then the farmer receive just double his present return for food crops without advancing the price to the consumer. If the Farm Board contemplated in the pending bill, with all the broad powers and resources granted at its command, will eliminate the useless charges and tolls taken from his products in transit, the farmer will materially benefit because of it. But if the board spends its effort in stabilizing farm prices below the cost of production, in dabbling with temporary surpluses that settle nothing permanently, the half billion dollars given the board to operate on will be wasted, with no benefits resulting.

In addition to this bill, the administration now proposes tariff revision as a measure of farm relief. A tariff bill has been brought into the House which seems to have administration sanction. It will cost the farmer many times over what amount of benefit he can possibly derive from the few increased rates given his products in it, a very small amount of which can be affected favorably. The advances on what he will have to buy will be many millions of dollars out of his pocket more than he can possibly realize from the few crumbs dropped to him.

Under pretense of relieving the farmer, the President, after calling an extra session with loud acclaim, is now in the act of butchering him, or holding the coats of those who are butchering him, to make a holiday for the Mellon-Grundy privilege crowd. In other words the farmer is found suffering from tariff poisoning, and Doctor Hoover is giving him a compounded dose of arsenic. He asked for bread; the President is giving him a stone. Less than 1 out of every 10 increases in the bill is on farm products. Virtually all of them are on industry and can have but one possible result—to "relieve" the farmer of what he has left.

If it is sincerely desired to help the farmer's plight, I call up for consideration a matter which if settled rightly would relieve agriculture, add greatly to our national resources and national defense, stimulate industrial development, and reimburse the Government for large expenditures already made. I refer to that wonderful power and navigation project partially completed at Muscle Shoals, Ala. The nature and purposes of this great plan seem to have been the most talked of and the least understood of any undertaking by the Government in recent years. As a war measure and a permanent plan of national defense the Government expended \$130,000,000 on a dam and nitrate plant there. The act authorizing this construction provided for the production of nitrates there to be used in the manufacture of explosives in emergencies. To guarantee an adequate supply at all times for this purpose the Congress said this nitrogen should be used for the manufacture of fertilizer when no emergency existed.

Peace came and the immediate urge subsided. In the general let down from a war pitch selfishness seemed to permeate everything. Fertilizer manufacturers saw in the completion of this project the production of cheaper fertilizer, so that they have tirelessly fought this consummation. The so-called Power Trust, seeing the possibility of a monopoly of great power resources in that section, joined in the fight to keep it out of any hands that would develop it, as they do not yet need it and desire no competition. As the project stands, with one dam in operation, the Alabama Power Co. is leasing some 20 per cent of the power generated at 2 mills per kilowatt-hour, and other power is wasting.

Over 300 miles above Muscle Shoals, up on the Clinch River in the State of Tennessee, is a proposed site for a dam, known as Cove Creek. It is not a power dam primarily, but a storage dam. It is held by engineers that by constructing a dam at this point there will be formed an inland lake covering 53,000 acres of land. Its purpose will be to store the water at flood time and release it at normal low-water periods so as to keep the flowage at all dams below constant; thereby doubling the primary power of every dam. You can readily see that Cove Creek is the key to the whole Tennessee River Valley power possibilities, including Muscle Shoals. Few, if any, of these dams would be economically justified without this regulation from Cove Creek.

A serious question has arisen over the respective rights of the Federal Government and the State of Tennessee if the Government constructs Cove Creek for purely power purposes. This is occasioned by the lack of settled property rights in the potential power of our

rivers. I take the position that the bed of a river and the water that flows over the bed is the property of the State through which it is passing. The Government can only control as to navigation and flood regulations. The power, I believe, belongs to the State, to the people thereof. And since the Government has been contemplating the taking over of Cove Creek, a majority of the Tennessee delegation in Congress has insisted that the rights of our State should be recognized in any act that authorizes the taking. But these rights can easily be adjusted, in my opinion, and the differences heretofore existing on this account need not delay this great development for a moment. All we have ever asked is a fair recognition of the elemental property rights of the State of Tennessee.

Assuming that these rights will be recognized, I venture to suggest the greatest measure of farm relief yet proposed to this session of Congress. There is pending what is known as the Madden bill for leasing this property to the American Cyanamid Co. Under this bill the Government would construct Cove Creek Dam. It would construct Dam No. 3 at Muscle Shoals, and thereby increase by 150 miles or more the navigable waters of the Tennessee River. It grants to lessee use of three other dam sites just below Cove Creek. All this property is leased for a term of 50 years. In return the cyanamide company is to pay the Government 4 per cent on all this investment, less an amount chargeable to navigation, and to excess prices of construction of Dam No. 2 in war time. Said company is also to pay an amortization charge each year sufficient to amortize the entire cost of all construction in 100 years. In addition to this, lessee agrees to manufacture a certain amount of concentrated fertilizer suitable for the use of our farmers at cost, plus 8 per cent. Lessee also announces its intention to use the balance of power generated by the leased property for the operation of electrochemical manufacturing plants.

But the principal concern we now have is with the fertilizer program. Mr. W. B. Bell, president of the American Cyanamid Co., assures us that his company is now making a concentrated fertilizer by the cyanamid process known as ammo-phos, which consists of 13 parts ammonium and 48 parts phosphate, or 61 per cent plant food. With this proportion, one ton of ammo-phos contains five times as much plant food as a ton of ordinary fertilizer, as mixed to-day. Four hundred thousand tons of this product is promised the farmer, at a reduction in cost of from 40 to 50 per cent. This will be the equivalent of 2,000,000 tons of fertilizer such as he buys to-day. The entire consumption per year in the United States is around 7,000,000 tons. The cyanamide product in this concentrated form can be shipped economically to most any part of the United States. With the plant located on the Tennessee, the farmers will have advantage of the cheapest transportation. It can reach by water all points on that river, the Cumberland, the Ohio, the Mississippi, and their tributaries.

The saving on freight rates and this reduction in price on so great a portion of this necessity would mean many millions of dollars saving to a depressed industry. The Government last year only received \$186,000 net income from the sale of power at Muscle Shoals, after expenses of upkeep and operation were deducted, on a present investment of \$130,000,000.

Naturally the fertilizer makers will oppose this bill. I sympathize with any industry that is about to be disturbed by progress, but I maintain that our farmers should not be charged this huge economic handicap simply because some capital is tied up in a worn-out industry. Above all classes in America to-day, they are entitled to be aided by modern, scientific methods in the production of their necessities. To throttle progress and economy in the production of fertilizer would be a high crime against almost one-third of our population now struggling to overcome fearful economic odds.

The farmers need this relief, oh, so much! The Government needs to turn a losing investment into a profitable one. Industry needs the power now hog tied by the procrastination in completing and disposing of Muscle Shoals. There is potential power on the Tennessee and its tributaries amounting to five or six million horsepower, enough to meet the demands of industry and public utilities for a century.

The South once thought its citizenship had been financially ruined by the liberation of 4,000,000 slaves. Yet, on this one river system, fifteen times that power is wasting constantly as the waters roll toward the sea, unused. It is not a sectional, but a national use for which we are trying to employ this great resource. It is a God-given heritage, and the people should no longer be kept out of its use and enjoyment.

In a special session, called for and dedicated to farm relief, how can those in control justify a failure to utilize this great plant for the farmer's use? We are urging the President, we are pleading with the organization leaders of the House and Senate, to delay no longer. Every available fact about this project and its possibilities are of record. Occasion for its greatest need is here. Mr. President, put it on the program for this special session and give us a chance to settle it for the untold benefit of agriculture.

TEMPORARY ASSISTANT FLOOR MANAGER OF TELEPHONES

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 53

Resolved, That the Clerk of the House be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of the contingent fund of the House, compensation at the rate of \$1,830 per annum, payable monthly, for the services of a temporary majority assistant floor manager of telephones, to be appointed by the Doorkeeper of the House. The compensation and employment hereby authorized shall start from April 15, 1929, and terminate June 15, 1929.

Mr. GARNER. From what committee does this come?

Mr. UNDERHILL. From the Committee on Accounts.

Mr. GARNER. Is it a unanimous report?

Mr. UNDERHILL. It is.

The resolution was agreed to.

INTERNATIONAL PETROLEUM EXPOSITION

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table House Joint Resolution 109, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the International Petroleum Exposition at Tulsa, Okla., to begin October 5, 1929, and for its immediate consideration.

I will say that the resolution has the approval of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH], who is the ranking Republican member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the absence of the chairman; the approval of the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LINTHICUM], the ranking minority member; the approval of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], minority floor leader; the approval of the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], majority floor leader. For the information of the House I desire to state that for a number of years the International Petroleum Exposition has been held at Tulsa, Okla. This resolution authorizes the President to send an invitation to the States of the Union and to foreign countries to attend and participate in the exposition. It is an identical resolution with others that have heretofore passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

Mr. GARNER. As I understand Mr. Speaker, this is the usual resolution and it entails no expense on the Government.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. It does not provide for the appropriation of any money.

Mr. GARNER. And the gentleman does not expect to ask for any appropriation?

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. No; and we never have.

Mr. HASTINGS. None was asked for last year.

Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma. No; the oil business is so hard up that we will let the tail go with the hide [laughter] and stand all the expenses.

Mr. HASTINGS. It is very important to Oklahoma and I hope there will be no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the President of the United States is authorized to invite by proclamation, or in such other manner as he may deem proper, the States of the Union and all foreign countries to participate in the proposed international petroleum exposition, to be held at Tulsa, Okla., beginning October 5, 1929, for the purpose of exhibiting samples of fabricated and raw products of all countries used in the petroleum industry and bringing together buyers and sellers for promotion of trade and commerce in such products.

SEC. 2. All articles that shall be imported from foreign countries for the sole purpose of exhibition at the International Petroleum Exposition upon which there shall be a tariff or customs duty shall be admitted free of the payment of duty, customs fees, or charges, under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during the exhibition to sell any goods or property imported for and actually on exhibition, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury may prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles when sold or withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States shall be subject to the duty, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of withdrawal; and on such articles which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling and necessary exposure, the duty, if paid, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal for consumption or use, and the penalties prescribed by law shall be enforced against any person guilty of any illegal sale, use, or withdrawal.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. O'CONNOR of Oklahoma, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the resolution was agreed to was laid on the table.

APPROPRIATION FOR THE AGRICULTURAL MARKETING ACT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 4016) making appropriations to carry out the provisions of the agricultural marketing act approved June 15, 1929.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

H. R. 4016

A bill making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for carrying into effect the provisions of the act entitled the "Agricultural marketing act," approved June 15, 1929, including all necessary expenditures authorized therein, the sum of \$151,500,000 to be immediately available, of which amount \$150,000,000 shall constitute a revolving fund to be administered by the Federal Farm Board as provided in such act, and \$1,500,000 shall be available until June 30, 1930, for administrative expenses in executing the functions vested in the Federal Farm Board by such act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Indiana is entitled to 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee to 20 minutes.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, under the farm bill which passed this House and the Senate and which has been signed by the President, there is an authorization for an appropriation of \$500,000,000. The appropriation asked here is for \$151,500,000, \$150,000,000 of which is for carrying out the purposes of the act, and the rest is for administrative expenses.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. Will the gentleman state why he did not appropriate the entire \$500,000,000?

Mr. WOOD. Because of the fact that there is no immediate necessity for it. There is no need to appropriate more money than is necessary.

Mr. GARNER. How does the gentleman know about the necessity for it?

Mr. WOOD. I call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to what the President said in his letter:

The additional amounts which will be needed by the board can not be determined except by the board itself, but as Congress might shortly recess I have thought it desirable that a preliminary sum should be provided. If the board finds it necessary to have further funds, it should be possible to make provision for them in ample time, and Congress will no doubt be in session by the time they are required.

Mr. GARNER. If I understand the gentleman correctly, the President said that he had no knowledge of what funds will be necessary to conduct this business for which this appropriation is made. Does he contemplate that Congress will take a recess, or does the gentleman contemplate that Congress will be in session until the wheat and cotton crops are handled?

Mr. WOOD. So far as the recess is concerned, I am not an authority on recessing. I have had my misgivings about the recess, but in any event it would take some time to set up the machinery for the transaction of this business under the act, and it occurs to me that not more than \$150,000,000 certainly could be used before we would get back here in the event there is a recess. If there is no recess, we could take care of the question when it arises.

Mr. GARNER. I do not see how that can occur to the gentleman from Indiana unless he has some knowledge of what amount will be necessary. It seems to me that if we can trust the board with \$150,000,000, we can as well trust them with \$500,000,000. Does the gentleman suppose the President is unwilling to trust the board with the entire amount?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly not. As he states in his letter as to the exact amount that may be needed no one can tell until the board is organized; they may not need the entire \$500,000,000.

Mr. GARNER. If we should appropriate \$500,000,000, the gentleman does not anticipate that the board would use it unless it is needed?

Mr. WOOD. Certainly not; but why appropriate a fixed amount for any activity when there is not that much money needed? We do not do it with reference to any other appropriation.

Mr. GARNER. Certainly not, because we know what is needed. But the gentleman says that the President says we do not know how much money will be necessary to run this board.

Mr. WOOD. That is correct.

Mr. GARNER. Why not give the board the full amount and then it can act and use the money which Congress authorizes. By giving them only \$150,000,000 now, if Congress is in recess, we give them the opportunity to say that Congress did not give them enough money.

Mr. WOOD. There would be some force to the gentleman's argument if it were not for the fact that we are going to be here in almost continuous session during this summer; we will be in session, so all agree if a recess is had, not later than the last of August or the first of September, and by that time in all probability the board will be organized and they will have some knowledge as to what their wants will be. It occurs to me there is no more necessity for appropriating more money than this than there would be for any other institution when the money is not needed.

Mr. ADKINS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. ADKINS. In the coming wheat crop we may have a surplus of 150,000,000 or 200,000,000 bushels. In the event that the board should act upon the coming wheat crop, they would organize the stabilization corporation and start to take off the market the surplus of 200,000,000 bushels. If they should do that, of course, there would not be enough money to take it all off. Is there any arrangement whereby they could go on and do that without an appropriation being made?

Mr. WOOD. I take it that they would have to act within the appropriation; but admitting what the gentleman states as a possibility, that there may be 150,000,000 to 200,000,000 bushels of a surplus, the board will have at least \$150,000,000 with which to take care of it.

Mr. ADKINS. That is a probable surplus now.

Mr. WOOD. In all probability they would not need to take up all of the 200,000,000 bushels if we had that much of a surplus. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I do not care to take up the time of the House with the discussion of this resolution. We have had no hearings upon it. As a matter of fact, I do not know just what information could have been developed if we had had hearings, because, as the President has indicated in the letter from which the gentleman from Indiana read, until the farm board has been actually appointed and has considered the matter, everyone is at sea, so to speak, with reference to the amount of money that may be needed at an early date. I am prepared to vote for whatever sum the President, in his judgment, thinks would be necessary. I would have supported a larger amount if he had asked it. I realize that just such a contingency as the gentleman from Texas refers to and as has been referred to also by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ADKINS] may happen.

We will be very soon in the midst of crop moving, and it may appear that a great deal more money will be needed for the major crops, such as cotton, wheat, corn, tobacco, and possibly other crops. The amount here appropriated may be by no means sufficient when the time comes when the money is actually and positively needed. But that is not a responsibility, of course, that rests on us. The President himself is responsible for the administration of this law which has recently been passed, and if in his judgment \$150,000,000 is all that is needed now I am willing to accept that amount, although I would have voted for a larger amount. But in view of what has been said, I think it can be said fairly now that if later on it should develop that a larger sum should have been asked for, surely Congress will not be responsible for that. I am sure nobody on either side would oppose the granting of the entire sum fixed by the bill.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If an additional amount is appropriated, it would simply be available in the Treasury until needed?

Mr. BYRNS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. JONES of Texas. And if that were done, they could use it in the event that an emergency arose?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Texas. If they would need more than \$150,000,000, they would be compelled to wait until Congress came back and the appropriation were made and the money available?

Mr. BYRNS. That is true.

Mr. JONES of Texas. Then, why not make the entire amount available and let the board use what they need in their discretion?

Mr. BYRNS. As I said, I would be perfectly willing to vote for the entire amount provided in the law. But this is all that the President has requested and all that is before us. As a matter of fact, I think, with the gentleman from Texas, that

Congress could well afford to appropriate the entire amount, because, as suggested by him, it will not be expended unless the Farm Board decides that it ought to be expended, and if the Farm Board which we hope will function and relieve agriculture believes that the entire sum is needed for the benefit of agriculture, they should have it when needed and not have to wait until an additional appropriation is made.

Mr. ALMON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. ALMON. Does not the gentleman think the entire amount of the appropriation, the \$500,000,000, or part of it, would have a very wholesome effect on the minds of the American farmer and assure him that the money would be available, and not leave in doubt the question whether the remainder of the money would be had hereafter?

Mr. BYRNS. I think that would be so.

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Of course, the success of the farm relief plan as embodied in this legislation is going to depend largely on the good judgment of the board itself. That is true, is it not?

Mr. BYRNS. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. Does not the gentleman from Tennessee think it would be a mistake for us here to be continually butting in now and trying to tell the board what to do?

Mr. BYRNS. I think so; but I do not think the appropriation of the full amount of \$500,000,000 could be construed as interfering with the farm board. It would rather be an indication to the farm board that Congress is willing to give all the aid in its power.

Mr. DENISON. Is it customary for Congress to make these great appropriations, even if authorized by law, before the executive department asks for them?

Mr. BYRNS. No; and that is the reason why I favor this resolution.

Mr. DENISON. If we should go ahead and appropriate the full amount, some one would introduce a resolution directing the board to go ahead and spend it.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. HASTINGS].

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I want to express my surprise and disappointment at the fact that not more than \$150,000,000 is contained in this appropriation. Of course, I am going to support that amount, but when the farm relief bill came in from the Committee on Agriculture it contained an authorization of \$500,000,000, and many of us on both sides of the aisle criticized the bill for the reason that it did not contain an actual appropriation. But it came from the legislative committee, and the legislative committee was not authorized to do anything else other than to report an authorization and not an actual appropriation. It is a mistake when we try to shirk responsibility. It is ours. We have led the country to believe that this revolving fund is going to carry \$500,000,000. It will not do it. There is an authorization, but not an appropriation, of \$500,000,000. The act, as I understand, was approved by the President on Saturday, and the fact of its approval was reported to the House only a moment ago. The people of the country are going to be disappointed when we go to our several homes during the recess and are asked why we did not make the full appropriation of \$500,000,000. You will be compelled to say, "The President estimated \$150,000,000 as enough." The President does not make a definite statement in his letter. The President's letter merely indicates that, so far as he has present knowledge, that \$150,000,000 is all that is needed. We may take a recess this week, and it may be that the House will not reassemble until November. Now, in the meantime you will have a 900,000,000-bushel crop of wheat to aid in marketing, and you will not only have a surplus of 200,000,000 bushels to deal with but you will have the entire crop to stabilize and you will need more than \$150,000,000 to stabilize the wheat crop.

Let me invite your attention to the fact that the average crop of cotton is approximately 14,000,000 bales. We exported last year 8,546,419 bales of cotton. The cotton-picking season begins in lower Texas in August, and soon therefore our cotton marketing season is on. We produced last year 2,839,959,000 bushels of corn. The moving and marketing of corn will begin in the early fall.

In my judgment, this board should have the entire revolving fund at its disposal, namely, \$500,000,000.

Let us quit talking about evading responsibility on our part. The responsibility for the origination of appropriations is with the Congress. The responsibility of this legislation is with the Congress, and I am sure, at this stage of the game, the Congress itself has as much information as to how much it

thinks this board should have or will be required as the President of the United States or as the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois and Mr. ADKINS rose.

Mr. HASTINGS. I have only about two minutes remaining. You have plenty of time to reply to me or else I would yield.

For us to fail to make the full appropriation is deception to the public. The people, through the press, have been led to believe that we were going to make available the full amount of \$500,000,000 and not wait for developments as to future appropriations.

Every Member will be embarrassed in answering the inquiries of your constituents when you have to tell them that only \$150,000,000 has been actually appropriated and made available, especially when you will have to advise them that it may be an indefinite length of time before the Congress of the United States is going to assemble again.

I am in favor of making now the entire appropriation of \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund, and I favor placing that amount at the disposal of the board and making it available for use as the occasion may require.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HASTINGS. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. One hundred and fifty million dollars is not simply chicken feed; it is an awful lot of money, and nobody need be embarrassed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Oh, if the gentleman does not know anything more about agriculture than his question indicates—I have tried to explain here that we produced last year approximately 900,000,000 bushels of wheat, 2,839,959,000 bushels of corn, and that we produced in 1928 approximately 14,000,000 bales of cotton, and of course the gentleman or anyone else who knows anything at all about agriculture knows that \$150,000,000 is an insufficient amount to handle or stabilize these major crops.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman certainly is not trying to have the entire country believe that the United States Government is going to buy all of these three crops. That is deception.

Mr. HASTINGS. Everyone knows that we authorized an appropriation of \$500,000,000.

Why, after extended hearings both in the House and Senate, did we authorize an appropriation of \$500,000,000 as a revolving fund if it was not thought that that amount would be needed? As I have tried to explain, the three major crops of wheat, corn, and cotton will mature and be harvested and marketed perhaps before Congress reconvenes after we recess. I am trying to make it clear that the full amount of \$500,000,000 should be appropriated as a revolving fund now. We should throw our full financial force behind this board to begin with if we hope to make the law a success.

You say we may not need it. We will need it between now and November, during the crop-marketing season, if we are ever going to need it. If we do not need it this year, why did we authorize \$500,000,000 to be appropriated? We did that and led the country to believe that the amount is now available.

There were no hearings on this bill. No committee has reported it. There is no report to show why the amount of \$150,000,000 was estimated for.

I am trying to discharge my full duty as a friend of agriculture by calling attention to the fact that we should vote the entire appropriation.

This bill comes up on suspension day, and no amendment is in order. The records show that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill. Let the country understand that no amendment under these circumstances can be offered, not an "i" dotted nor a "t" crossed, and for that reason no one in the House has attempted to amend the bill. My hope is that the Senate will give it more detailed consideration and amend the bill so as to appropriate the full amount, and if it does and such an amendment comes back to the House, the House should concur in it.

Practically every speech made while the farm bill was under consideration in the House and in the Senate referred to the fact that it established a revolving fund of \$500,000,000. That amount was authorized. After the bill had been passed and signed by the President an estimate for only \$150,000,000 is submitted, and only that amount is carried in this bill.

During the war we appropriated \$1,000,000,000 to stabilize wheat alone. Everyone recognizes that agriculture is in a deplorable condition. It should receive adequate assistance at once. I submit that no one has attempted to make any explanation satisfactory to the friends of agriculture why the amount of the revolving fund is reduced through this appropriation to \$150,000,000.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the gentleman from Indiana to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken, and two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

COMPENSATION OF OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE LEGISLATIVE BRANCH OF THE GOVERNMENT

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 3966) to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves to suspend the rules and pass the bill which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the following positions and annual (except where specified otherwise) rates of compensation are hereby established:

SENATE

OFFICE OF THE VICE PRESIDENT

Secretary to the Vice President, \$4,620; clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerks—one \$2,280, one \$2,160.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the Senate, \$1,680.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Secretary of the Senate, including compensation as disbursing officer of salaries of Senators and of contingent fund of the Senate, \$8,000; assistant secretary, Henry M. Rose, \$4,500; chief clerk, who shall perform the duties of reading clerk, \$5,500 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; financial clerk, \$5,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant financial clerk, \$4,200 and \$600 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; minute and journal clerk, \$4,500 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; principal clerk, \$3,840; legislative clerk, enrolling clerk, and printing clerk at \$3,540 each; chief bookkeeper, \$3,600; librarian, \$3,360; executive clerk, file clerk, and assistant journal clerk at \$3,180 each; first assistant librarian and keeper of stationery at \$3,120 each; assistant librarian, \$2,460; skilled laborer, \$1,740; clerks—three at \$3,180 each, one \$2,880, one \$2,760, two at \$2,400 each, two at \$2,040 each; two assistant keepers of stationery at \$2,040 each; assistant in stationery room, \$1,740; messenger in library, \$1,560; special officer, \$2,460; assistant in library, \$2,040; laborers—two at \$1,620 each, three at \$1,380 each, one in stationery room, \$1,680.

DOCUMENT ROOM

Superintendent, \$3,960; first assistant, \$3,360; second assistant, \$2,700; assistant, \$2,040 in lieu of position authorized by Senate Resolution 342 of the Seventieth Congress; two clerks at \$2,040 each; skilled laborer, \$1,740.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks and messengers to the following committees: Agriculture and Forestry—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Appropriations—clerk, \$7,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; 2 assistant clerks at \$4,200 each; 3 assistant clerks at \$3,000 each; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; messenger, \$1,800. To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Civil Service—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Claims—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Commerce—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Conference majority of the Senate (in lieu of positions authorized by S. Res. No. 50 of the 71st Cong.)—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Conference minority of the Senate—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,900; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,880 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Education and Labor—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Expenditures in the Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerks, \$1,800. Finance—clerk, \$4,200; special assistant to the committee, \$3,600; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,700; assistant clerk, \$2,400; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; 2 experts (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority) at \$3,600 each; messenger, \$1,800. Foreign Relations—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk,

\$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800; messenger, \$1,800. Immigration—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Intercoastal Canals—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Interstate Commerce—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,580 each; assistant clerk, \$2,220. Library—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Manufactures—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,400; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,400; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Patents—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Pensions—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; 4 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; 3 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each; additional clerk, \$1,800. Printing—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Privileges and Elections—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Public Lands and Surveys—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; 2 assistant clerks at \$2,220 each. Revision of Laws—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,400; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Rules—clerk, \$3,900, to include full compensation for the preparation biennially of the Senate Manual under the direction of the Committee on Rules; assistant clerk, \$2,880; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800. Territories and Insular Possessions—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,580; assistant clerk, \$2,220; additional clerk, \$1,800.

CLERICAL ASSISTANCE TO SENATORS

Clerical assistance to Senators who are not chairmen of the committees specifically provided for herein, as follows: Seventy clerks, at \$3,900 each; 70 assistant clerks, at \$2,400 each; and 70 assistant clerks, at \$2,220 each. Such clerks and assistant clerks shall be ex officio clerks and assistant clerks of any committee of which their Senator is chairman.

Seventy additional clerks, at \$1,800 each, 1 for each Senator having no more than 1 clerk and 2 assistant clerks for himself or for the committee of which he is chairman; messenger, \$1,800.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS AND DOORKEEPER

Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper, \$8,000; 2 secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$5,400 each; 2 assistant secretaries (1 for the majority and 1 for the minority), at \$4,320 each; messengers—5 (acting as assistant doorkeepers, including 1 for minority), at \$2,400 each; 37 (including 1 for minority), at \$2,040 each; 1 at \$1,560, 1 at card door, \$2,880; clerk on journal work for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, to be selected by the official reporters, \$3,360; Deputy Sergeant at Arms and storekeeper, \$4,440; clerk, \$2,460; stenographer in charge of furniture accounts and records, \$1,740; upholsterer and locksmith, \$2,400; cabinetmaker, \$2,040; 3 carpenters at \$2,040 each; janitor, \$2,040; skilled laborers—4 at \$1,680 each, 1 at \$1,560; laborer in charge of private passage, \$1,680; 3 female attendants in charge of ladies' retiring rooms, at \$1,500 each; 3 attendants to women's toilet rooms, Senate Office Building, at \$1,500 each; telephone operators—chief, \$2,460, 7 at \$1,560 each; night operator, \$1,380; telephone page, \$1,260; laborer in charge of Senate toilet rooms in old library space, \$1,200; press gallery—superintendent, \$3,660, assistant superintendent, \$2,520, messenger for service to press correspondents, \$1,740; laborers—3 at \$1,320 each, 34 at \$1,260 each; 21 pages for the Senate Chamber, at the rate of \$4 per day each, during the session.

Police force for Senate Office Building under the Sergeant at Arms: Special officer, \$1,740; 16 privates, at \$1,620 each.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$3,060; chief clerk, \$2,460; wagon master, \$2,040; 7 mail carriers, at \$1,740 each; 2 riding pages, at \$1,440 each.

FOLDING ROOM

Foreman, \$2,460; assistant, \$2,160; clerk, \$1,740; folders—chief, \$2,040, 7 at \$1,560 each, 7 at \$1,380 each.

CAPITOL POLICE

Captain, \$2,460; 3 lieutenants, at \$1,740 each; 2 special officers, at \$1,740 each; 3 sergeants, at \$1,680 each; 44 privates, at \$1,620 each.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON PRINTING

Clerk, \$4,000 and \$800 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; inspector under section 20 of the act approved

January 12, 1895 (U. S. C. title 44, sec. 49), \$2,820; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,400; chief indexer, \$3,480; cataloguers—one, \$3,180, two at \$2,400 each.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OFFICE OF THE SPEAKER

Secretary to the Speaker, \$4,620; parliamentarian, \$4,500, and for preparing Digest of the Rules, \$1,000 per annum; assistant parliamentarian, \$2,760; clerk to Speaker, \$2,400; clerk to Speaker, \$1,440; messenger to Speaker's table, \$1,740; messenger to Speaker, \$1,680.

CHAPLAIN

Chaplain of the House of Representatives, \$1,680.

OFFICE OF THE CLERK

Clerk of the House of Representatives, including compensation as disbursing officer of the contingent fund, \$8,000; journal clerk, two reading clerks, and tally clerk, at \$5,000 each; enrolling clerk, \$4,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; disbursing clerk, \$3,960; file clerk, \$3,780; chief bill clerk, \$3,540; assistant enrolling clerk, \$3,180; assistant to disbursing clerk, \$3,120; stationery clerk, \$2,880; librarian, \$2,760; assistant librarian, and assistant file clerk, at \$2,520 each; assistant journal clerk, and assistant librarian, at \$2,460 each; clerks—one, \$2,460, three at \$2,340 each; bookkeeper, and assistant in disbursing office, at \$2,160 each; four assistants to chief bill clerk at \$2,100 each; stenographer to the Clerk, \$1,980; assistant in stationery room, \$1,740; three messengers at \$1,680 each; stenographer to journal clerk, \$1,560; laborers—three at \$1,440 each, nine at \$1,260 each; 15 telephone operators at \$1,560 each; substitute telephone operator when required, at \$4 per day; property custodian and superintendent of furniture and repair shop, who shall be a skilled cabinetmaker or upholsterer and experienced in the construction and purchase of furniture, \$3,960; two assistant custodians at \$3,360 each; locksmith and typewriter repairer, \$1,860; messenger and clock repairer, \$1,740.

OFFICE OF SERGEANT AT ARMS

Sergeant at Arms, \$8,000; Deputy Sergeant at Arms, \$3,180; cashier, \$4,920; two bookkeepers at \$3,360 each; Deputy Sergeant at Arms in charge of pairs, pair clerk and messenger, and assistant cashier, at \$2,820 each; stenographer and typewriter, \$600; skilled laborer, \$1,380.

Police Force, House Office Building, under the Sergeant at Arms: Lieutenant, \$1,740; 19 privates at \$1,620 each.

OFFICE OF THE DOORKEEPER

Doorkeeper, \$6,000; special employee, \$2,820; superintendent of House press gallery, \$3,660; assistant to the superintendent of the House press gallery, \$2,520; chief janitor, \$2,700; messengers—17 at \$1,740 each, 14 on soldiers' roll at \$1,740 each; laborers—17 at \$1,260 each, 2 (cloakroom) at \$1,380 each, 1 (cloakroom) \$1,260, and 7 (cloakroom) at \$1,140 each; 3 female attendants in ladies' retiring rooms at \$1,680 each; attendant for the ladies' reception room, \$1,440; superintendent of folding room, \$3,180; foreman of folding room, \$2,640; chief clerk to superintendent of folding room, \$2,460; 3 clerks at \$2,160 each; janitor, \$1,260; laborer, \$1,260; 31 folders at \$1,440 each; shipping clerk, \$1,740; 2 drivers at \$1,380 each; 2 chief pages at \$1,980 each; 2 telephone pages at \$1,680 each; 2 floor managers of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$3,180 each; 2 assistant floor managers in charge of telephones (1 for the minority), at \$2,100 each; 41 pages, during the session at \$4 per day each; press-gallery page, \$1,920; superintendent of document room (Elmer A. Lewis), \$3,960; assistant superintendent of document room, \$2,760 and \$420 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; clerk, \$2,320; assistant clerk, \$2,160; 8 assistants at \$1,860 each; janitor, \$1,440; messenger to pressroom, \$1,560.

SPECIAL AND MINORITY EMPLOYEES

For the minority employees authorized and named in the resolution of April 15, 1929—1 at \$3,180 (J. J. Sinnott), 5 at \$2,820 each.

Assistant foreman of the folding room, authorized in the resolution of September 30, 1913, \$1,980.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of April 28, 1914, \$1,380.

Laborer, authorized and named in the resolution of December 19, 1901, \$1,380.

Clerk, under the direction of the Clerk of the House, named in the resolution of February 13, 1923, \$3,060.

Successors to any of the employees provided for in the five preceding paragraphs may be named by the House of Representatives at any time.

Office of majority floor leader: Legislative clerk, \$3,960; clerk, \$3,180; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560.

Conference minority: Clerk, \$3,180; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560. The foregoing employees to be appointed by the minority leader.

Two messengers, one in the majority caucus room and one in the minority caucus room, to be appointed by the majority and minority whips, respectively, at \$1,740 each.

POST OFFICE

Postmaster, \$5,000; assistant postmaster, \$2,880; registry and money-order clerk, \$2,100; 34 messengers (including one to superintend transportation of mails) at \$1,740 each; substitute messengers and extra services of regular employees, when required, at the rate of not to exceed \$145 per month each; laborer, \$1,260.

OFFICIAL REPORTERS OF DEBATES

Six official reporters of the proceedings and debates of the House at \$7,500 each; assistant (John J. Cameron), \$3,000; clerk, \$3,360; six expert transcribers at \$1,740 each; janitor, \$1,440.

COMMITTEE STENOGRAPHERS

Four stenographers to committees, at \$7,000 each; janitor, \$1,440.

COMMITTEE EMPLOYEES

Clerks, messengers, and janitors to the following committees: Accounts—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,560. Agriculture—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,560. Appropriations—clerk, \$7,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; assistant clerk, \$5,000 and \$1,000 additional so long as the position is held by the present incumbent; three assistant clerks at \$3,900 each; assistant clerk, \$3,600; two assistant clerks at \$3,300 each; messenger, \$1,680. Banking and Currency—clerk, \$2,760; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Census—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Civil Service—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Claims—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Coinage, Weights, and Measures—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Disposition of Useless Executive Papers—clerk, \$2,760. District of Columbia—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,260. Education—clerk, \$2,760. Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress—clerk, \$2,760. Elections No. 1—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Elections No. 2—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Elections No. 3—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Enrolled Bills—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Expenditures in Executive Departments—clerk, \$3,300; janitor, \$1,260. Flood Control—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Foreign Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,260. Immigration and Naturalization—clerk, \$3,300; janitor, \$1,260. Indian Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,260. Insular Affairs—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Interstate and Foreign Commerce—clerk, \$3,900; additional clerk, \$2,640; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560. Irrigation and Reclamation—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Invalid Pensions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,880; expert examiner (Norman E. Ives), \$2,700; stenographer, \$2,640; janitor, \$1,500. Judiciary—clerk, \$3,900; assistant clerk, \$2,640; assistant clerk, \$1,980; janitor, \$1,500. Labor—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Library—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Merchant Marine and Fisheries—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Military Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560. Mines and Mining—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Naval Affairs—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560. Patents—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. Pensions—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,160; janitor, \$1,260. Post Offices and Post Roads—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,560. Printing—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,560. Public Buildings and Grounds—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Public Lands—clerk, \$2,760; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Revision of the Laws—clerk, \$3,300; janitor, \$1,260. Rivers and Harbors—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460; janitor, \$1,560. Roads—clerk, \$2,760; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Rules—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,100; janitor, \$1,260. Territories—clerk, \$2,760; janitor, \$1,260. War Claims—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$1,740; janitor, \$1,260. Ways and Means—clerk, \$4,620; assistant clerk and stenographer, \$2,640; assistant clerk, \$2,580; clerk for minority, \$3,180; janitors—one, \$1,560, one \$1,260. World War Veterans' Legislation—clerk, \$3,300; assistant clerk, \$2,460.

The offices, positions, and rates of compensation hereinbefore specified shall be in lieu of those enumerated under the same captions in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, approved February 28, 1929, and the appropriations contained in such act for the compensation of the officers and employees of Congress are hereby made available toward the payment of the compensation of the officers and employees of Congress at the rates and in the numbers specified in this section.

The indefinite appropriations for the compensation of pages for the Senate and House of Representatives, contained in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for certain expenses of the legislative branch incident to the first session of the Seventy-first Congress," approved April 26, 1929, are hereby made available for the compensation of such pages at the per diem rates specified herein.

The appropriation for "Public printing and binding," contained in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, is hereby made available for the compensation of the chief indexer and cataloguer of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the rates specified herein in lieu of the rates specified in such appropriation.

CLERK HIRE, MEMBERS, DELEGATES, AND RESIDENT COMMISSIONERS

SEC. 2. The clerk hire for each Member, Delegate, and Resident Commissioner shall be at the rate of \$5,000 per annum and shall be paid

In accordance with the act of January 25, 1923 (U. S. C. title 2, sec. 92): *Provided*, That no person shall receive a salary from such clerk hire at a rate in excess of \$3,900 per annum. The appropriation for "Clerk hire, Members, Delegates, and Resident Commissioners," contained in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, is hereby made available toward the payment of clerk hire as provided in this section.

ARCHITECT OF THE CAPITOL

SEC. 3. Section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide for the classification of civilian positions within the District of Columbia and in the field services," approved March 4, 1923 (U. S. C. title 5, sec. 662), is hereby amended so as to include within the definition of the term "department," contained in the second paragraph of such section, the office of the Architect of the Capitol: *Provided*, That this section shall not operate to reduce the compensation of the present incumbent in any position nor to prevent the Architect of the Capitol from employing professional and technical services in connection with construction projects at such rates of compensation as he may deem necessary in the public interest.

The appropriations under the office of the Architect of the Capitol, contained in the legislative appropriation act for the fiscal year 1930, are hereby made available toward giving effect to the provisions of this section.

SEC. 4. Hereafter employees detailed from the Bureau of Pensions to duty with committees of Congress having jurisdiction of pension legislation shall not receive additional compensation while on such detail at a rate in excess of \$50 per month each.

SEC. 5. The short title of this act shall be the "legislative pay act of 1929."

SEC. 6. This act shall take effect on July 1, 1929, and the act entitled "An act to fix the compensation of officers and employees of the legislative branch of the Government," approved May 24, 1924, is hereby repealed after June 30, 1929.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Arkansas opposed to the bill?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes; I am.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Arkansas in opposition to the bill.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I reserve my time.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen, I want to say that I am opposed to this bill for more reasons than one. First of all, I am opposed to this bill because it was introduced in this House on the 14th day of June, 1929, and this is now the 17th day of June. The bill has had no consideration by the House or by a committee, so far as I know. It could have had no intelligent consideration in the time it has been before this body.

Mr. BLAND. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Not just now.

Mr. BLAND. I will say I am in accord with the gentleman's view.

Mr. GLOVER. I will yield in a moment.

When an important matter like this is to be brought before the Congress it ought to have careful consideration.

We were brought here in this session of the Congress for the purpose of considering legislation in the interest of the farmer. This bill came into my hands about five minutes ago. I have not had time to read it. I got a copy of the Senate bill, which I presume is an exact copy of this one, and have scanned it over some. We met here for the sole purpose of trying to legislate in the interest of the farmer. I want any man or woman on the floor of this House to tell me the relationship between a farmer and this bill.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. No, sir; not just now. I am satisfied that the gentleman might possibly make an explanation of that kind, but I am sure it will not be satisfactory to me at least. It may be to the farmers of the country, but he may have that time to do it as far as I am concerned. When I take this bill and figure it up it carries with it about \$800,000 additional expense for this House and the other body.

You say you want to help the farmer. You can save the farmer \$800,000 at least if you will defeat this bill. This bill carries with it an additional thousand dollars for clerk hire for each Member of Congress of both the House and Senate. We have 435 Members and that would be \$435,000 in this House alone if it only applied to the House Members. But it carries that for the other body. And then, in addition to that, there

is not a single position as I look over the bill but what is raised about 25 per cent.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Not just now. The bill increases the price we are to pay for every employee mentioned in it. There is an additional appropriation here for the President of the Senate's assistants and also for the Speaker of the House. The expense of the office of the Speaker of the House is increased from \$13,700 to \$21,140. I think we have a Speaker that can handle this job by himself. [Laughter.] I think when it comes to adding additional employees and charging it back under the pretext that you are going to help the farmer it is an absolute absurdity. And there is not a man in the House but what knows it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Not just now. Four hundred and thirty-five thousand dollars additional that goes for clerk hire. Now, gentlemen, I believe that we ought to have efficiency everywhere. I want efficiency in my office, and I say to you that I can have it under the present conditions. I have two persons working in my office. When I came here to Congress I made an inquiry of what there was available for me to give to my district of 12 counties and I found in the Agricultural Department that I had 163,000 bulletins there for distribution. I have two employees and we have sent out in two months over 70,000 of these bulletins to the voters and the farmers in my district. [Applause.]

I say to you that I can take my force and send out all that is necessary under the present salary, and they are both very much pleased with their jobs. Neither has asked to be relieved, and if they could not do the work I have a dozen on my waiting list that would be glad to take their places.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. GLOVER. No; I am afraid the gentleman from Wisconsin would ask me something about the eighteenth amendment, and I decline. [Laughter.]

Mr. MAAS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Not just now. I realize, gentlemen, that I may be standing alone in opposing this bill. I challenge you to be men and women, to go on record, and let the farmers know that you are ready and willing to do something for them. Will you do it? I ask you to do it.

A MEMBER. We have just given the farmers \$150,000,000.

Mr. GLOVER. Yes; and now you are taking \$1,000,000 of that back.

SEVERAL VOICES. Oh, no.

Mr. GLOVER. You are taking \$800,000 of it back, and that comes pretty near to a million as I figure it. [Cries of "Vote! Vote!"]

I know you want to vote. I know you want to go on record. I will be glad to see you in the Record, and I hope we have enough that will stand up here and put you on record. I want you to go back home to your people and say, "Yes; I went up there to help the farmers, and I increased the salary of my force, and you will have to pay them. I helped you out of \$1,000 in that way, and 434 more in the House did the same thing."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. If the Congress has anything to add to my State, rather than to add it in the way of salaries, I wish it would send it to the sufferers from the Mediterranean fly.

Mr. GLOVER. Yes; I know that you want tariff on black-strap and fruit-fly remedies down there, and I expect they need them. I say to you that we had better give it to the extermination of the boll weevil or something of that kind rather than to come here and put it into this sort of waste.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. BLAND. Could we not much better put it into post offices throughout the country?

Mr. GLOVER. Absolutely so. I have in my district of 12 counties two little post offices owned by the Government, and if you were to put them up for sale to-day they would not bring \$40,000; and the idea of talking about going out and taking money that ought to be used for that purpose and putting it into such a thing as this! We ought to be ashamed of it. That is the way I look at it.

Mr. MOREHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. MOREHEAD. I want to heartily concur with the gentleman that everyone who is in favor of or opposed to this bill ought to have a chance to go on record, and I agree at least with the gentleman's statement in that respect. We ought

to be willing enough and courageous enough to put ourselves on record for or against this bill.

Mr. GLOVER. Not only that, but I hope the gentleman will be courageous enough to vote against the bill; and if he will do that, he will be of some help to his people.

There are so many objections in this bill that I can not discuss them all in 20 minutes. There is one provision raising the salaries very high and then giving \$1,000 extra to the employee so long as that present employee is serving. You fellows have been talking about a bounty. You are going to give to these fellows an additional thousand dollars in the way of a bounty as long as they stay there. I believe we ought never to have inefficient service; we ought to have the best, and if the present employees need that the others ought to have it also. It is not right to come here with a provision of that kind in this bill. I remember very well a short time ago when the question came up here of raising Congressmen's salaries, and that was a proposition something like this. I read that Record carefully. I remember that the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Blanton, stood on the floor of this House, as shown by the Record, and voted for the right, and I would be willing for one, to sacrifice the amount raised on my salary, raised by that act, and let it go back to my people in the form of post offices and any relief to them where they absolutely need it.

Mr. MOREHEAD. And I want to further state that I indorse very much the gentleman's attitude in regard to taking snap judgment and bringing in a bill of this magnitude at this particular time. I further state that if given the opportunity I shall vote against the bill, because I think it is unfair and unjust legislation at this time. [Cries of "Vote!"]

Mr. GLOVER. Not only that, but when this bill was read here by the Clerk I dare say that there were not three people in this House who heard it read, because of the confusion in the Hall. Who knows what it contains? Very few in this body.

A MEMBER. Everybody.

Mr. GLOVER. Yes; "everybody." That is the trouble. There are too many "everybodies" here that are to be benefited by this. In addition to that, I would like to have an investigation made and published to the world of just how some are spending what they get now. I ask you to go back and tell your folks how you do it.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman that it might be well to learn how some of the allowance is allotted, but the gentleman said something a moment ago with reference to some employees who are granted \$1,000 additional. Does the gentleman know those employees?

Mr. GLOVER. I do not.

Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri. Does the gentleman realize their value to the House and the Senate, and that they could not be replaced for twice the amount that we are appropriating for the work that they are doing?

Mr. GLOVER. I never did believe that one man holds a monopoly on wisdom or anything of that kind. I believe there are other men just as efficient as the men employed now, and I have not one word of criticism against any employee in any department of this work, but I say that when you try to tell me that one man is the only man who can do a certain class of work, I resent it.

Mr. BLAND. Then the bill might be amended, if considered under the ordinary rules of the House, and those clerks who are entitled to it could be taken care of properly.

Mr. GLOVER. Absolutely.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GLOVER. Yes. I shall be glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. The gentleman mentioned the work done in his office. From the talk about the work in his office we would be led to the conclusion that the only work performed by the gentleman's clerks consists in sending out agricultural bulletins. If that is the truth, I see no necessity for raising their salaries.

Mr. GLOVER. I will say to the gentleman that my office work has not been confined to that alone. Not a letter has come into my office that has not been answered within 12 hours after its arrival there. Not only that, but every interest of my constituency when they have appealed to me has been looked after since I have been here, and I shall continue to do that. [Applause.]

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Of course, the gentleman knows that no Member is obliged or compelled to take this increase. The gentleman can continue his force at their present rate and thereby curtail the amount appropriated by that much.

Mr. GLOVER. And I realize there is no danger whatever of the gentleman from New York doing that.

Mr. LaGUARDIA. Oh, I am not going to do it, because I believe in paying a decent, living wage.

Mr. GLOVER. I do also, but I do not believe in playing this kind of a game. Not only that, but there are employees in this bill who are drawing large salaries who do not work six months in the year. There is no reason for this bill coming up at this time in the manner in which it does. It is a brand-new baby, it is only three days old, and here you are trying to put whiskers on it in three days. [Laughter.] I say to you that it is not right, and I appeal to the conscience of every woman and man in this House who has a right to vote to cast your vote against this measure. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Mr. Speaker, my personal sympathies are with the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER]. I so frequently have been placed in the same position of a hopeless, helpless minority of one that I certainly can sympathize with him, even if I do not sympathize entirely with his remarks.

This is not a brand-new baby by any means. It had its birth some two or three years ago, and I had to adopt it in its infancy. I nurtured it, gave it a great deal of time, attention, and care, and then introduced it to this body. I found myself in the position of the gentleman from Arkansas, with not a friend in the House, not because I raised salaries—for I did, and they ought to be raised. [Applause.] There is no group of employees in the Government service outside of the legislative group who has given such value for the services rendered as they are giving here. My contention, however, is that this bill does not go far enough, and I will mingle one or two brickbats with the bouquets I hand the Appropriations Committee. They have done a marvelous job. Only those of us who have gone through a similar experience can realize the tremendous pressure brought to bear and the necessity of extensive study in order that justice and equity may be the guiding influence. So I do not raise any question in reference to the increases in salary in the legislative department. My contention is that the committee did not go far enough. I realize that it would have added to the troubles and trials and tribulations and possibly jeopardize the bill if it had. But they should have discharged some 21 employees who are a disgrace to the Government, who affect adversely the morale of other employees, and who ought not to be allowed to remain on the pay roll for one more day.

I do not want to embarrass the committee or embarrass an individual by calling anybody by name, but I made a thorough investigation of the situation and found that there are about 20 employees who had little or nothing to do but draw their breath and sign the pay roll. The other employees, although some of them work only six months in the year, have to work pretty hard during that six months' period, and they were paid a pitiful wage.

One of the contentions of the gentleman from Arkansas is that some of the present employees are given extra pay so long as they hold certain positions. That is the sensible, business way to do it. Heretofore we fixed salaries indiscriminately and raised an important position to a salary commensurate with the work, and then when that employee unfortunately passed out of the picture a new and green man was employed and was paid an excessive wage as a beginner. It is my contention that that was all wrong, and that we should have these positions classified, and that when a man became efficient, as our reporters are and as our clerks are, then that man should receive a salary commensurate to the service he renders.

But I can not reconcile my position with the position taken by the committee when they allowed four pair clerks to remain on the roll when the work is done by the minority and majority whips. I can not reconcile my position with theirs when they provided for an assistant or deputy sergeant at arms, whose only duty is to bring the mace upstairs and take it down again. The last incumbent did not do that. In the session previous to this one of the pair clerks was doing that work. I can not reconcile my position with the employment in the House and Senate of some men who bring discredit on the positions they occupy and the Members they serve.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Illinois. I think the gentleman is in error as to the Assistant Sergeant at Arms. He has many duties to perform in addition to those described by the gentleman from Massachusetts. He is a deputy sergeant at arms, and he serves processes for the House. It is true that the man who formerly

held that position was ill and not here, but like many others he was still kept on the roll.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Conditions change, and very probably they have changed in the past two years. Otherwise the Committee on Appropriations would never have brought in an increase of salary for this individual and perpetuated him in office.

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Certainly.

Mr. MONTAGUE. I find myself very much in sympathy with the contention of the gentleman. How can we realize and carry out the suggestion the gentleman has made under this method of procedure?

Mr. UNDERHILL. It can not be done; my idea was, and it ought to be, that we should introduce this in a regular session, discuss it thoroughly, and let Members such as myself, who have a load on my chest, offer amendments to the bill. I gave four months of vacation time to this work. It cost me personally \$2,000 to make this investigation, and I brought in a classification of employees and recommendations that I thought was really worthy of consideration. Because I touched that holy of holies, patronage, because I proposed to discharge unworthy employees, it developed that certain employees protected by patronage had more power than a Member of Congress had who had given his time to a careful inquiry and report of conditions. They prevented the consideration of that bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been sore for two years because of the treatment I received, and I hope when I get rid of this bill I shall feel more friendly toward some Members of the House. The facts are that this ought not to be presented at this time. But, nevertheless, the fact is that it is going to go through and no one Member can stop it. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. Yes.

Mr. SIMMONS. The statement was made by the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. GLOVER], in his denunciation of this bill, that each Member of Congress is to receive \$1,000 additional under the bill. I think it ought to be made plain to the Members of the House that no Member of the Congress is to receive one cent additional under this bill.

Mr. UNDERHILL. I suppose the chairman of the committee will make that clear.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman is in error about that. I said the clerks to the Members.

Mr. SIMMONS. The gentleman twice said that the Members would get the \$1,000.

Mr. UNDERHILL. The Members know perfectly well the large volume of work in their offices. I have had a sympathy for the Members and have felt as though there ought to be a larger sum appropriated for their assistance.

Why, it is not for the Members; it is for the people back home. You can give more efficient service to the people back home; you can spend more of your time on the floor of the House; you can spend more of your time in the departments. If you have sufficient funds, you can get an efficient secretary, and not be confined to a clerk, or a stenographer, or a typist for some of this departmental work which means so much to the people back home.

The bill is a fine bill, Mr. Wood; it is a fine bill, Mr. MURPHY; it is a good bill, Mr. BYRNS; but I do wish you had gone down to the roots of the matter and made it a much better bill by discharging some 20 employees who have no business here on the Hill and are liable to cause a scandal if they are permitted to remain.

Mr. MCCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. UNDERHILL. I am through.

Mr. WOOD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I will not take very much time with reference to this measure. All of you who have read the report are fully cognizant of what this bill contains and what changes have been made.

It includes an equalization of the salaries of practically 2,500 people in the House and in the Senate. It has been generally known that there has been a disparity in the compensation for the services rendered on this side and those rendered over there that has not been well for the conduct of public business. Those over on the other side doing work comparable to the work of clerks upon this side have been receiving more pay and it occurred to various Members of the House that, if possible, there should be some arrangement made whereby, as nearly as we could, we would arrive at a plan where similar services on this side would be paid the same as on the other side.

I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. UNDERHILL] for the compliment he has paid this committee. It has not been an easy task, and I hope that such a job will never fall to my

lot again. We have done conscientiously what we thought was right.

We have raised to an exceptional degree only those salaries where exceptional service is being rendered, and I think if you go from one end of the bill to the other and pick out the individual cases where exceptions have been made you will find no fault with the exceptions if you are cognizant of the work and the labor that the men holding these positions are doing.

The salary fixed in this bill for those who are serving here on the Hill is a little bit lower in many respects than the salary fixed in the executive departments, and I would have you bear this in mind. There is not a clerk here on the Hill who has the retirement privilege. When he goes out, he goes out forever without any hope of any pension coming to him.

There is another reason if any preference is to be made it should be made in favor of those upon the hill, and that is because of the fact they have to pay all their expenses. They have to pay their railroad fare back and forward and this amounts to a considerable item. True, some of those who are employed here do not give their services for the entire year, but the service they render while here as compared with the volume of service rendered in the executive departments while they are at work, I suspect amounts to more in the number of hours put in than in the executive departments.

So we have no apologies to make for this report or for this measure. If there are any Members here who feel they do not need the increase that has been given for their clerk hire, they do not have to accept it, and the gentleman from Arkansas was in error when he said that each Congressman is increasing his pay \$1,000. If he is cognizant of the law, he knows that is not correct.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman misunderstood me. I said that the secretaries or the clerks would get an additional thousand dollars. I am not unaware of the facts.

Mr. WOOD. If the gentleman from Arkansas finds he can send out all the bulletins that are necessary in his community and answer all the letters with the force he has, there is nothing in the bill to compel him to accept any more. [Applause.] But there are those here who do need extra services. There are clerks serving as secretaries to Congressmen that I am free to say are of more value to their districts than the Congressman himself.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. There are a number of employees on this pay roll receiving less than \$900 a year. Think of asking a man to work for the Government and support a family on \$900, and there are 50 of them.

Mr. WOOD. With reference to that matter, I will say that we adopted a general plan for raising the bulk of these salaries, which follows:

Present salaries:	Amount of increase annually
For employees receiving less than \$2,000.....	\$240
For employees receiving \$2,000 and over but less than \$3,000..	300
For employees receiving \$3,000 and over but less than \$4,000..	360
For employees receiving \$4,000 and over but less than \$5,000..	420

The addition of these flat rates has been made and in establishing the salary the rate has been fixed at the nearest figure which would give an even sum divisible by 12 in monthly factors of \$5. For example, the salary of the largest group of law-paid employees is now \$1,010. The addition of the \$240 brings the salary to \$1,250, and \$10 has been added, making the rate \$1,260, which is an amount evenly divisible in \$5 monthly increments. By applying the flat rates to existing salaries it works out on a percentage basis which is not more than 25 per cent for any salary less than \$2,000, not more than 15 per cent for any salary from \$2,000 and over but not more than \$3,000, and not more than 10 per cent for any salary of \$3,000 and over.

By adopting a flat rate of increase the salary of those at the top of one bracket and those at the bottom of the next higher bracket were adjusted so that the one in the lower bracket would not receive more after the increase than the one in the next upper bracket. It required a great deal of adjusting to do this.

I think from first to last if we are to pay those who serve us here according to the same rules that the same service has been receiving in the executive departments we ought to all be for this bill. I am not in favor of discriminating against those who serve us and favoring those who are in the executive departments.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD. I yield.

Mr. UNDERHILL. Will the gentleman agree to one amendment?

Mr. WOOD. I will not accept any amendment.

Mr. HUDSON. I was about to ask the same question. May I call the gentleman's attention to this item on page 10 in the office of the Sergeant at Arms—you give the lieutenant \$1,740 and the privates \$1,620 each. You are putting all the responsibility of the entire police management of the House Office Building, with its office force to maintain order and everything else, and asking this man to do it at a difference of \$120. It seems to me that is not quite a fair distribution. I wish the gentleman might accept an amendment.

Mr. WOOD. If we were to do that we would have to do it all along the line for those receiving a like salary. This bill may not be a perfect measure, but it is as nearly perfect as it was possible to make it.

Mr. UNDERHILL. You have considered the case of every employee.

Mr. WOOD. Yes.

Mr. UNDERHILL. That serves notice on the Committee on Accounts to which committee all these appeals are made, that all resolutions for further increase of pay shall go from now on into the wastebasket.

Mr. WOOD. I want to say to the gentleman that these individual resolutions have been the bane of this whole business. Members of the House are constantly beseeched by some one in their district for increase of pay, and the Member introduces a resolution increasing the salary of that one particular person when it may be that there are hundreds of others in just the same position with the same character of work and their salary is not increased at all. So you see what happens. That same thing is true and practiced moreover on the other side than it is here. This committee was appointed to review this situation, and I hope the bill will have the acceptance of at least two-thirds of the Members of the House. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. GLOVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas demands the yeas and nays.

The question of ordering the yeas and nays was taken, and seven Members rose, not a sufficient number.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLAND) there was 168 yeas and 18 noes.

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote as showing that no quorum is present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes a point of no quorum. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and twenty-one Members present, a quorum. Two-thirds having voted in favor thereof, the rules are suspended and the bill is passed.

LIST OF MINNESOTA SOLDIERS BURIED IN AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a list of the World War veterans of Minnesota buried in France.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAAS. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, Minnesota is proud of the loyal part her sons have always taken in defense of our country. The record of her sons' achievements in war has been indeed glorious. It was the first State, through its distinguished governor, to offer volunteers to President Lincoln when civil strife threatened disruption of the Union.

Nowhere in the annals of any war is there a more noble or inspiring example of courage, devotion, and unflinching loyalty than the brave and successful rush of Colonel Colvill's First Minnesota Volunteers at Gettysburg that stopped Pickett's charge, and without doubt won the battle and probably the Civil War at the sacrifice of 83 per cent of the strength of the regiment.

On every front Minnesotans did their heroic part.

The Thirteenth Minnesota in the Philippines during the war with Spain and subsequent insurrection played a most significant and successful part.

The participation of Minnesota boys in the World War carried on the best traditions and added new glories to an already fine and noble record.

A great many sons of Minnesota gave their lives in that great conflict and lie buried in France, Belgium, and England.

The names, organizations, and grave locations of those brave, courageous youths of Minnesota who made the supreme sacrifice and who forever will sleep in foreign cemeteries near those dread battle fields I wish to make a matter of permanent record. The list has been furnished to me by our very efficient Quartermaster General of the United States Army. The list is as follows:

KEY TO NAMES OF PERMANENT CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

FRANCE

No. 1232. Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Mont-faucon, Meuse.

No. 1764. Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34. Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine (near Paris).

No. 636. Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608. Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1233. St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

BELGIUM

No. 1252. Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium.

ENGLAND

No. 107-E. Brookwood American Cemetery, Brookwood (near London), England.

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FIRST DIVISION					
Bockenbauer, Benj. F.	Pvt. Co. E, 16 Inf.	1232	39	35	A
Carlson, Albert R.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 16 Inf.	1232	13	10	E
Fela, Frank Felix	Pvt. Co. A, 16 Inf.	1233	20	6	B
Goodspeed, Fredk. N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co. 16 Inf.	1232	19	29	C
Kowasewich, Tady	Pvt. Co. M, 16 Inf.	608	29	3	D
Kruger, Ben A.	Pvt. Co. L, 16 Inf.	1232	8	28	B
Petrimean, Geo.	Sgt. Hq. Co., 16 Inf.	1232	29	21	C
Schultz, Tom	Pvt. Co. E, 16 Inf.	608	27	7	C
Stanley, Arthur R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 16 Inf.	34	30	8	B
Gaylord, Arthur R.	1 lt. Co. I, 18 Inf.	636	1	22	D
Durand, Simon J.	Cp. Co. L, 18 Inf.	608	12	25	A
Hassell, Zolo G.	Sgt. Hq. Co. 18 Inf.	1232	23	1	C
Hoban, Michael	Pvt. Co. C, 18 Inf.	1232	19	31	D
March, Erwin	Cpl. Co. I, 18 Inf.	1233	8	10	B
McCarthy, Eugene H.	Pvt. Co. B, 18 Inf.	1232	17	12	F
Keary, David W.	Cpl. Co. E, 18 Inf.	608	20	36	B
Rasbe, Theodore E.	Pvt. Co. D, 18 Inf.	1232	9	6	C
Seeland, Albert	Pvt. Co. A, 18 Inf.	1232	4	43	H
Elliott, Clark R.	Lt. col. 26 Inf.	608	16	5	D
Molander, Axel R.	Sgt. Co. H, 26 Inf.	608	10	13	D
Swanson, Paul E.	Pvt. Co. L, 26 Inf.	608	26	29	D
Bertelson, Peter	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 28 Inf.	1232	29	36	D
Frydelund, John O.	Sgt. Co. C, 28 Inf.	608	3	13	A
Hayek, Edward	Cpl. Co. E, 28 Inf.	636	3	15	O
Rosemoen, Theodore	Pvt. Co. B, 28 Inf.	1764	36	5	B
Sager, Frank	Pvt. Co. D, 28 Inf.	608	11	25	D
Schmaal, Arthur	Cpl. Co. M, 28 Inf.	1232	33	24	E
Koth, Christ.	Mech. Co. D, 1 Br. M. G. Bn.	636	6	19	C
Frank, Oscar C.	Pvt. Co. C, 2 Br. M. G. Bn.	636	8	16	C
Lande, Armin	Pvt. Co. C, 2 M. G. Bn.	608	34	13	D
Zengel, Geo.	Pvt. Co. A, 2 M. G. Bn.	608	12	9	O
Moberg, Carl E.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 6 F. A.	1232	25	34	O
Cary, Clifford L.	Pvt. Bty. F, 7 F. A.	1232	9	6	D
Keating, Edw. J.	Sgt. 1 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	1233	7	28	D
Smith, Chas. T.	Pvt. Co. A, 2 F. S. Bn.	1233	11	1	C
SECOND DIVISION					
Anderson, Ole M.	Pvt. Co. K, 9 Inf.	1232	20	24	A
Arnold, Wm. E.	do.	1232	40	10	F
Beecher, Floyd C.	do.	1232	36	23	A
Gatrell, Clarence R.	Pvt. Co. F, 9 Inf.	608	13	39	D
Greber, Charley	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 9 Inf.	1764	34	10	A
Halvorson, Odean H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 9 Inf.	1232	5	37	A
Hietala, Rudolph	do.	1232	12	30	E
Kath, Louis F. T.	Pvt. Co. D, 9 Inf.	1232	35	12	B
Lee, Harold C.	Cpl. Co. A, 9 Inf.	1764	36	12	A
Sherman, Elmer O.	Pvt. Co. D, 9 Inf.	1232	29	17	H
Vos, Nicholas	Pvt. Co. F, 9 Inf.	1764	62	12	B
Walsh, Leo	do.	1232	17	18	H
Anderson, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. B, 23 Inf.	1232	26	18	D
Bergan, Geo. E.	Pvt. Co. F, 23 Inf.	1232	32	35	G
Bjornhang, Herman	Cpl. Co. C, 23 Inf.	1233	36	10	B
Earley, Eugene J.	Pvt. Co. F, 23 Inf.	1233	8	3	D
Falke, Harold	Cpl. Co. E, 23 Inf.	608	23	14	D
Flatner, Lawrence M.	Pvt. Co. G, 23 Inf.	1232	32	22	D
Floot, Thos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 23 Inf.	1232	28	18	A
Hanson, Nick	Pvt. Co. F, 23 Inf.	1233	27	3	B
Ketcham, Arthur	Pvt. Co. I, 23 Inf.	1232	6	13	H
McBride, Leo A.	Pvt. Co. B, 23 Inf.	1764	60	9	B
Sholaas, Hubert R.	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	8	37	A
Swenson, Harold T.	Cpl. Co. A, 23 Inf.	608	29	32	B
Weisser, Frank R.	Pvt. Co. I, 23 Inf.	1233	19	1	D
Wollscroft, Lewis E.	Pvt. Co. L, 23 Inf.	1232	15	29	E
Zimny, Mike	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	9	12	C
Fereh, Aaron John	1 lt. 67 Co. 5 Regt. U. S. M. C.	1232	5	25	B
Arneson, Ludwig Oscar	Pvt. 55 Co. 5 Regt. U. S. M. C.	1233	28	27	C
Bergdahl, Carl Frithiof	Cpl. 55 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	32	43	H
Burdick, Edw. Michael	Pvt. 18 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	34	10	3	B
Cobb, Fred W.	Cpl. 49 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	13	22	A
Dingle, Richard Wallace	Pvt. 20 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	62	7	B
Donohue, Wm. Alfred	Pvt. 1 cl. 49 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	22	13	F
Duncan, Frank	Cpl. 17 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	22	41	B
Erwin, Jos. A.	Pvt. 17 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	31	28	E

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SECOND DIVISION—CON.					
Fischer, Robt. McCauglin	Cpl. 20 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	46	2	A
Hatfield, Harry Stuart	Pvt. 8 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	11	25	E
Kroll, Fred Wm.	Pvt. 20 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	14	22	G
MacConnell, Chas. Franklin	do.	1764	89	8	A
McDermott, Edw. John	do.	1233	10	28	C
Meighen, Thos. Virgel	Pvt. 49 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	34	27	7	B
O'Connell, Richard Clement	Pvt. 55 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	6	17	H
Olson, Chas. Arthur	Pvt. 8 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1233	36	22	B
Reany, Harvey Withrow	Pvt. 7 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1233	20	8	B
Stenmark, Nelo August	Pvt. 67 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	53	1	B
Johnston, Scott Martin	2 lt. 76 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	34	21	4	B
Adwell, Palmer Alexander	Pvt. 79 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	26	10	A
Ahl, Max Henry	Cpl. 95 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	6	16	C
Dalquist, Oscar Edw.	Pvt. 80 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	2	30	B
Farrant, Oliver Chapman	Sgt. 95 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	34	5	4	C
Haugsten, Nils Olaf	Pvt. 78 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	11	37	D
Hart, Herbert LeRoy	Pvt. 96 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	30	15	H
Isaacs, Solomon	do.	1764	8	12	B
LaBelle, Clarence Richard	Pvt. 78 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	38	30	E
Markham, Burt Austin	Pvt. 80 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1233	28	29	D
Murphy, Michael Jas.	Sgt. 97 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	14	11	C
Suominen, Tuurie Henry	Cpl. 75 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	43	2	B
Tompkins, Wm.	do.	1232	7	40	B
Van Camp, Geo. Miller	Sgt. 97 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	3	13	F
Walling, Arthur Nathaniel	Pvt. 79 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	19	23	B
Watson, John Howard	Pvt. 96 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	24	40	D
Williams, Carl Oscar	do.	1233	15	22	D
Wisted, David Gilbert	Pvt. 82 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	24	1	A
Peterson, Harold R.	Wag. Sup. Co. 4 M. G. Bn.	1233	1	9	B
Carnegie, David	Pvt. 15 Co., 6 M. G. Bn. U. S. M. C.	1232	34	35	H
Hansen, Reuben Edwin	Pvt. 23 Co., 6 M. G. Bn. U. S. M. C.	1232	20	26	B
Bailey, Harold N.	Cpl. Bty. A, 15 F. A.	1232	37	23	G
McGinnis, John (Miller, John, jr., alias)	Cook Bty. C, 17 F. A.	1232	7	36	C
Hankins, Walter	Cpl. Co. A, 2 Engrs.	1232	16	15	C
Staton, George L.	Wag. Tk. Co. 2 Engrs.	608	14	36	A
Nelson, Arthur E.	Sgt. 1 cl. Co. C, 1 F. S. Bn.	1764	28	11	B
Allen, Wm. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 2 Mil. Pol.	1764	45	8	A
THIRD DIVISION					
Mook, Peter	Hrshr. Hq. Tp.	1232	11	37	A
Dougherty, Francis E.	Capt. Hq. Co. 4 Inf.	1232	30	18	H
Klanska, Frederic L.	Pvt. Co. F, 4 Inf.	1232	38	3	E
Lund, Frank	Pvt. Co. C, 4 Inf.	1232	11	28	A
Burelbach, Nicholas J.	Cpl. Co. C, 7 Inf.	1232	6	44	C
Goetz, Helmath A.	Pvt. Co. B, 7 Inf.	1764	78	1	A
Erickson, Melvin	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1232	12	34	E
Hardy, Walter	Pvt. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1232	16	43	E
Kirkpatrick, Ray	Pvt. Co. M, 30 Inf.	1232	10	26	B
Langemo, Nickolaie	do.	1232	14	35	G
Layton, Arthur J.	Pvt. Co. G, 30 Inf.	608	19	34	A
Parker, John P.	Pvt. 1 cl. 30 Inf.	608	20	2	B
Pickett, Leonard	Pvt. Co. F, 30 Inf.	1232	28	14	C
Bangert, Emil H.	Pvt. Co. H, 38 Inf.	1232	11	15	H
Cross, Chas. O.	Pvt. Co. A, 7 M. G. Bn.	1764	21	11	A
Nelson, Philip E.	Pvt. Co. D, 9 M. G. Bn.	608	20	39	A
Olson, Axel W.	Cpl. Co. C, 9 M. G. Bn.	1232	37	43	C
Peterson, Leo C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. B, 10 F. A.	1232	37	41	G
Strand, Ola H.	do.	1232	10	4	D
Simons, John	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E, 18 F. A.	608	21	19	C
Anderson, Andrew C.	Pvt. Bty. B, 76 F. A.	1233	11	24	D
Easter, Geo. R., jr.	Pvt. Hq. Det. 6 Engrs.	1233	31	19	D
Gilkey, Edw. N.	Pvt. Co. E, 6 Engrs.	1764	16	10	A
Smith, Earl A.	Wag. 6 Engrs. Tn.	1233	22	18	A
Harris, Wm. Geo.	Sgt. M. D. Vet. Field Unit.	34	35	2	A
FOURTH DIVISION					
Baumann, Walter F.	Pvt. Co. B, 39 Inf.	1232	8	12	E
Demel, Adolph	Pvt. Co. G, 39 Inf.	608	28	22	C
Goltz, Herman F.	Cpl. Co. I, 39 Inf.	608	22	32	B
Jelk, Arvid J.	Pvt. Co. D, 39 Inf.	1764	26	6	B
Jenson, Hesley E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 39 Inf.	1232	8	26	D
Mellin, Arthur A.	Pvt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	608	1	12	D
Myhre, Willid P.	Pvt. Co. E, 39 Inf.	608	22	1	C
Niemozyk, Peter	Pvt. Hq. Co. 39 Inf.	1232	26	3	H
Peterson, Carl V.	Pvt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	608	10	7	D
Roy, Harry	Mech. Co. G, 39 Inf.	608	19	12	D
Schreiber, Fred C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 39 Inf.	608	33	17	A
Schwieger, Arnold	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 39 Inf.	1232	20	38	F
Wiener, Louis	Pvt. Co. A, 39 Inf.	1232	8	1	H

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FOURTH DIVISION—CON.					
Arnet, Philip G.	Pvt. Co. E, 47 Inf.	608	22	6	D
Asmus, Hugo	do.	608	14	18	B
Grondal, Magnus	Pvt. Co. C, 47 Inf.	608	7	6	B
Hanson, Ruben	Cpl. Co. L, 47 Inf.	608	8	8	B
Hansen, Alfred B.	Pvt. Co. G, 47 Inf.	1232	1	12	A
Hunett, Ray	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 47 Inf.	608	10	5	B
Johnson, Albin R.	Pvt. Co. B, 47 Inf.	608	2	8	A
Johnson, Gustaf	do.	608	13	31	C
Johnson, Olof M.	Pvt. Co. D, 47 Inf.	608	30	16	A
Kilen, Thorvald	Pvt. Co. E, 47 Inf.	608	35	11	D
Koppie, Julius A.	Pvt. Co. M, 47 Inf.	608	20	4	C
Keensing, Wm.	Pvt. Co. F, 47 Inf.	1764	16	8	A
Lamaack, Peter	Pvt. Co. E, 47 Inf.	1232	11	7	C
Meyer, Bennie A.	Pvt. Co. H, 47 Inf.	608	17	7	D
Mullaart, Emil L.	Pvt. Co. G, 47 Inf.	608	24	7	B
O'Connell, Cyril J.	Pvt. Co. K, 47 Inf.	1232	37	23	F
Ostad, Martin	do.	1232	10	6	E
Scalise, Angelo	Pvt. Co. K, 47 Inf.	608	18	5	A
Simon, Carl	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 47 Inf.	1232	5	15	H
Skogen, Halyard H.	Pvt. Co. K, 47 Inf.	1764	3	4	B
Smith, Leon N.	Pvt. Co. L, 47 Inf.	608	6	8	A
Trebesch, Albert	Pvt. Co. I, 47 Inf.	608	8	9	A
VonBeheen, Fredk.	Pvt. Co. F, 47 Inf.	608	6	37	B
Wright, Clarence O.	Pvt. Co. M, 47 Inf.	608	4	3	A
Adamson, Robt. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 58 Inf.	1764	38	2	B
Anderson, Alfred W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co., 58 Inf.	1232	7	25	F
Anderson, Nels.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 58 Inf.	608	17	34	D
Burwan, Andro	do.	608	3	12	H
Callawaert, Alberis	Pvt. Hq. Co., 58 Inf.	1232	4	21	C
Das, Henry	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 58 Inf.	1764	17	2	A
Daskam, Melvin W.	Pvt. Co. B, 58 Inf.	608	6	24	C
Defoe, Peter	Pvt. Hq. Co., 58 Inf.	1232	24	21	C
Fisher, John	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 58 Inf.	1232	33	15	H
Gear, John	Pvt. Co. F, 58 Inf.	1232	37	28	E
Giantvalley, Vincent L.	Cpl. Co. E, 58 Inf.	1764	18	1	A
Gourd, Charley	Cpl. Co. C, 58 Inf.	1232	17	1	H
Gustafson, Herman F.	Pvt. Co. B, 58 Inf.	608	38	24	A
Heppner, Jacob G.	Pvt. Co. H, 58 Inf.	1232	8	6	F
Johnson, Victor	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 58 Inf.	1232	31	31	B
Lamb, Ralph	Pvt. Co. D, 58 Inf.	608	27	28	C
Lancello, John A.	Pvt. Co. E, 58 Inf.	608	10	28	C
Lee, Otto	Cpl. Co. A, 58 Inf.	1232	28	25	E
Maleski, Anton	Cpl. Co. E, 58 Inf.	1764	41	12	A
Marquardt, Geo.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co., 58 Inf.	608	10	11	D
Narzee, Stanley	Pvt. Co. D, 58 Inf.	608	29	2	C
Nelheim, Lars L.	Pvt. Co. K, 58 Inf.	1764	70	6	A
Nilsson, John	Pvt. Co. E, 58 Inf.	1764	32	2	B
Olson, Carl	do.	608	20	19	C
Peterson, Axel J.	Pvt. Co. K, 58 Inf.	608	15	11	D
Pordum, Harry E.	Pvt. Co. C, 58 Inf.	608	14	12	C
Trenda, John M.	Pvt. Co. B, 58 Inf.	608	32	13	B
Lane, Melvin L.	Pvt. Co. D, 59 Inf.	1764	55	18	A
Morgenthaler, Anton	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 59 Inf.	1764	73	4	A
Peterson, Thorwald	Sgt. Hq. Co. 59 Inf.	1232	29	26	G
Reece, Herbert R.	Cpl. Co. I, 59 Inf.	1232	14	6	F
Sunflet, Martin	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 59 Inf.	1764	90	8	A
Swift, Robt. J.	Pvt. Co. F, 59 Inf.	1232	23	40	C
Floding, Edw. W.	Pvt. Co. C, 11 M. G. Bn.	1232	30	17	G
Olson, Arthur J.	Pvt. Co. C, 12 M. G. Bn.	1233	26	19	A
FIFTH DIVISION					
Jans, Max T.	Pvt. Co. L, 6 Inf.	1232	14	19	F
Johnson, Arngrim J.	do.	1232	10	44	D
Othoudt, Lester	do.	1232	19	8	D
Perrizo, Frank D.	Pvt. Co. E, 6 Inf.	1232	31	16	F
Poyhart, Martin A.	do.	1232	16	22	F
Gorgeschiltz, Jacob J.	Sgt. Co. K, 11 Inf.	1232	2	14	D
Frame, Esery L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 61 Inf.	1232	17	12	D
Viall, Frank C.	Wag. Sup. Co. 61 Inf.	1232	13	17	A
Christopher, John W.	Sadr. Co. A, 7 Engrs.	1233	13	19	D
Wene, Aino	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 7 Engrs.	1232	30	14	A
Graves, Irving L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 9 F. S. Bn.	1232	16	7	A
Nelson, Lloyd O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 9 F. S. Bn.	1233	2	25	B
SIXTH DIVISION					
Brooks, Leo A.	Pvt. Co. K, 53 Inf.	1232	35	12	H
Hellerud, Benneth	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 53 Inf.	1232	23	35	D
Kaplon, David	Pvt. Co. F, 53 Inf.	1232	37	16	F
Klaudinger, John L.	Pvt. Co. E, 53 Inf.	1232	13	37	C
Pedersen, Hans W.	Cpl. Hq. Co. 53 Inf.	1233	29	1	A
Peterson, Albert E.	Pvt. Co. D, 53 Inf.	1232	8	16	F
Pitich, Johan	Pvt. Co. M, 53 Inf.	1232	17	10	D
Holanbeck, Theodore F.	Pvt. Co. E, 53 Inf.	1232	27	42	B
Velt, Willie J.	Pvt. Co. D, 53 Inf.	1232	39	34	C
Suren, Frank J.	Pvt. Co. B, 18 M. G. Bn.	1232	10	10	F
SEVENTH DIVISION					
Dubinsky, John	Pvt. Co. M, 34 Inf.	1233	36	14	D
Hall, Andrew O.	Pvt. Co. A, 55 Inf.	1233	26	12	D
Erickson, Axel T.	Pvt. Co. G, 56 Inf.	1233	11	7	C
Franklin, Walter H.	Cpl. Co. B, 56 Inf.	1232	14	27	D
Mittet, Alex.	Pvt. Co. E, 56 Inf.	1233	20	29	D
Odegard, Swan	Pvt. Co. G, 56 Inf.	1233	14	10	B
Olsen, Sigurd	Pvt. Co. I, 56 Inf.	1233	18	28	D
Larson, Curt G.	Pvt. Co. M, 64 Inf.	1233	4	5	A
Eggen, Richard	Pvt. Co. E, 5 Engrs.	1233	25	29	C
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Born, Edward	Pvt. Co. E, 101 Inf.	1232	36	38	G
Baumann, Albert B.	Pvt. Co. A, 102 Inf.	1233	32	7	D
Frederiksen August C.	do.	1233	8	29	C
Kladi, Einard T.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 102 Inf.	34	17	11	A
Peterson, Gust A.	Pvt. Co. A, 102 Inf.	1232	3	12	H
Shanesy, Walter J.	Pvt. Co. E, 103 Inf.	1232	6	19	E
Mohr, Wm. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 104 Inf.	1232	34	20	G
Brown, Wallace O.	Pvt. Bty. B, 102 F. A.	1233	31	21	C
Whiting, Robt.	Pvt. Bty. E, 102 F. A.	1233	31	21	B

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION					
Pusari, Otto	Pvt. Hdqrs.	34	31	6	B
Adams, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. F, 109 Inf.	1232	12	36	D
Anderson, Allen V.	Pvt. Co. G, 109 Inf.	1232	32	9	C
Bartel, Otto G. A.	Pvt. Co. F, 109 Inf.	1232	19	44	B
Christiansen, Jons.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 Inf.	1232	4	36	B
Degenza, Rocco	Pvt. Co. B, 109 Inf.	1232	19	2	D
Erickson, Jonas M.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 Inf.	608	9	34	D
Hewins, Jas. G.	do.	1233	35	5	C
Lampi, Svante	Pvt. Co. H, 109 Inf.	1232	37	35	B
Loiso, Victor	Pvt. Hdqrs.	1232	33	45	A
Moen, Sever	Pvt. Co. E, 109 Inf.	1232	2	6	F
Oberg, Olof J.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 Inf.	1232	40	22	H
Pomponio, Giambuttista	do.	1233	31	2	C
Templeton, Jas. A.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 109 Inf.	1232	12	35	B
Volavka, Henry	Pvt. Co. L, 109 Inf.	608	7	18	B
Dommer, John F.	Pvt. Co. F, 110 Inf.	1232	19	20	B
Regelking, Elwell G.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 110 Inf.	1232	3	33	G
Haugen, Kjalmar	Pvt. Co. G, 110 Inf.	1232	20	30	A
Anderson, Otto A.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 111 Inf.	1233	29	22	D
Bakken, John S.	Pvt. Co. H, 111 Inf.	1232	30	40	C
Bartelt, Rudolph T.	do.	1232	21	12	E
Boomgard, Kelly	Pvt. Co. E, 111 Inf.	1232	9	17	E
Burns, Mike V.	Pvt. Co. H, 111 Inf.	1232	31	27	C
Hermann, Philip	do.	1232	11	24	D
Miller, Rancy	Pvt. Co. C, 111 Inf.	1233	30	26	C
Schuetz, Paul R.	Pvt. Co. F, 111 Inf.	1233	19	6	D
Schulz, Martin Joe T.	do.	1232	35	14	D
Shelley, Howard C.	do.	1232	25	28	C
Ternes, John	Pvt. Co. C, 111 Inf.	1232	36	34	F
Sorenson, Stefanus	Pvt. Co. B, 112 Inf.	1233	18	16	B
TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION					
Fallon, Hubert	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 114 Inf.	1232	34	3	B
Werner, Mathias	Pvt. Co. L, 115 Inf.	1232	17	7	F
Widislaukis, Jos.	Pvt. Co. C, 115 Inf.	1232	13	35	E
THIRTIETH DIVISION					
Fischer, John	Pvt. Co. L, 117 Inf.	636	15	11	B
Hendricks, Robt. T.	Pvt. Co. A, 117 Inf.	636	1	33	A
Nys, Leon J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 117 Inf.	636	12	24	A
Peterson, Henry B.	Pvt. Co. M, 117 Inf.	608	7	39	D
Quamme, Albert O.	Pvt. Co. F, 117 Inf.	636	15	8	A
Schultz, Charley E.	Pvt. Co. A, 117 Inf.	636	12	14	A
Sorum, Adolph M.	Pvt. Co. H, 117 Inf.	636	10	8	C
Aldrich, Grover C.	Pvt. Co. M, 118 Inf.	636	14	6	C
Connelly, Wm. F.	Pvt. Co. K, 118 Inf.	636	3	34	A
Hegland, Bernhard	Pvt. Co. F, 118 Inf.	636	11	5	D
Jacobson, Edwin	Pvt. Co. F, 118 Inf.	636	15	23	A
Kiesel, Louis N.	Pvt. Co. F, 118 Inf.	636	4	20	A
Martin, Miles H.	Pvt. Co. D, 118 Inf.	636	15	17	B
Moe, Carl N.	do.	636	1	11	D
Nelson, Christian	Pvt. Co. I, 118 Inf.	636	1	14	A
Reloux, Leo O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 118 Inf.	636	15	24	E
Ridenour, Warren H.	Pvt. Co. H, 118 Inf.	636	3	34	B
Thompson, Arthur A.	Pvt. Co. C, 118 Inf.	636	10	14	D
Weagel, Ralph J.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 118 Inf.	636	3	12	A
Whalen, Ray T.	Pvt. Co. L, 118 Inf.	636	7	14	A
Engelhart, Irving B.	Cpl. Co. B, 119 Inf.	636	10	15	A
Groskreutz, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. K, 119 Inf.	636	12	34	B
Jensen, Conrad G.	Pvt. Co. F, 119 Inf.	636	12	1	B
Ross, Wendell A.	Pvt. Co. M, 119 Inf.	1252	8	2	B
Schraeck, Ole S.	Pvt. Co. A, 119 Inf.	636	8	29	A
Shodall, Enoch	Cpl. Co. F, 119 Inf.	636	16	22	A
Thomason, Solomon L.	Pvt. Co. C, 119 Inf.	636	5	8	C
THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Bach, Jos. E.	Pvt. Co. M, 125 Inf.	1232	19	34	H
Boor, Wm. P.	Pvt. Co. E, 125 Inf.	1232	9	44	A
Carvounis, Jas. J.	Pvt. Co. M, 125 Inf.	1232	4	35	G
Distler, Geo. A.	Pvt. Co. E, 125 Inf.	608	10	29	C
Johnson, Andrew M.	Pvt. Co. L, 125 Inf.	1232	26	19	G
Johnson, Cecil A.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 123 Inf.	1232	25	36	C
Kimbel, Ray J.	Sgt. Co. E, 125 Inf.	1232	3	44	A
Lyngren, Geo. H.	Pvt. Co. K, 125 Inf.	1232	9	13	A
Olson, Chester N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 125 Inf.	608	21	8	A
Olsson, Herbert T.	Pvt. Co. K, 125 Inf.	608	37	36	D
St. Anthony, Frank	Pvt. Co. F, 125 Inf.	608	13	16	D
Trautman, Otto	Pvt. Co. M, 125 Inf.	1232	5	6	H
Vasilion, Haralobos	do.	1232	10	22	D
Lade, Arthur	Pvt. Co. B, 126 Inf.	1232	22	22	D
Lea, Martin	Pvt. Co. I, 126 Inf.	608	3	37	B
Leslie, Martin O.	Cpl. Co. B, 126 Inf.	1232	36	19	D
Lund, Otto T.	Pvt. Co. M, 126 Inf.	608	23	11	B
Mather, Harry	Pvt. Co. D, 125 Inf.	1232	30	6	A
Bartelt, Ernest	Pvt. Co. H, 127 Inf.	1232	28	26	B
Dally, Theodore J.	Pvt. Co. E, 127 Inf.	1232	33	22	A
Diamond, Jack	do.	1232	30	45	C
Frahman, John	Pvt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	3	24	F
Goeswiler, Robt. C.	Pvt. Co. I, 127 Inf.	1232	10	4	E
Grugel, Mike	Pvt. Co. F, 127 Inf.	1232	11	35	A
Hagen, Geo. C.	Pvt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	25	17	E
Holjelie, Ole L.	Cpl. Co. B, 127 Inf.	1232	9	32	D
Janke, Otto A. W.	Pvt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	28	36	H
Kartjak, Martin	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 127 Inf.	1232	9	32	B
Kelly, Julius J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 127 Inf.	34	24	1	B
Miganovich, Blazo M.	Pvt. Co. E, 127 Inf.	1233	18	11	B
Ansems, Thos.	Pvt. Co. E, 128 Inf.	1232	40	20	A
Ball, Glenn J.	Pvt. Co. G, 128 Inf.	34	11	8	B
Bebier, Jas. J.	Pvt. Co. D, 128 Inf.	1232	35	31	H
Bjorbeck, Lars	Pvt. Co. G, 128 Inf.	1232	28	34	B
Bruno, Peter	Pvt. Co. E, 128 Inf.	1232	34	20	A
Eastlund, Ole A.	do.	1232	17	2	E
Erickson, Jens M.	Pvt. Co. G, 128 Inf.	1232	19	15	C
Gjerue, Almer E.	Pvt. Co. E, 128 Inf.	1232	38	17	K

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION—continued					
Hadrath, Byron J.	Pvt. Co. C, 128 Inf.	1232	4	25	D
Haugen, Emil	Pvt. Co. F, 128 Inf.	1232	34	7	B
Hesdal, Michael	Pvt. Co. M, 128 Inf.	1232	3	37	E
Hougard, Sam R.	Pvt. Co. C, 128 Inf.	1232	8	37	G
Jensen, Emil A.	Pvt. Co. A, 128 Inf.	1232	16	38	G
LeBuda, Emil	Pvt. Co. C, 128 Inf.	1232	7	38	D
Novack, Fred C.	Pvt. Co. H, 128 Inf.	1232	7	11	F
Petersen, Ernst A.	do.	1232	34	38	G
Svenkeson, Geo.	Pvt. Co. G, 128 Inf.	1232	36	20	A
Young, Linsley A.	Pvt. Co. B, 128 Inf.	1232	11	8	C
Polubitz, Wyllem F.	Pvt. Co. F, 107 Amm. Tn.	1232	34	28	D
THIRTY-THIRD DIVISION					
Besonowich, Rada	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 129 Inf.	1232	1	20	F
Chamberlain, Alphonso A.	Pvt. Co. C, 129 Inf.	1232	35	40	G
Eisel, Matte	Pvt. Co. G, 129 Inf.	1232	33	30	A
Servid, Leo	Pvt. Co. A, 129 Inf.	608	6	19	B
Paddock, Bernard J.	Pvt. Co. D, 130 Inf.	1232	16	32	C
Frederickson, Hildor	do.	1232	2	22	B
Jensen, Waldemar	do.	1232	31	30	C
Johnson, Ernest B.	Pvt. Co. K, 130 Inf.	1232	20	41	C
Johnson, Walter E.	Pvt. Co. B, 130 Inf.	34	17	2	B
Knutson, Albert	Pvt. Co. C, 130 Inf.	1232	13	41	B
Schue, Daniel I.	Pvt. Co. I, 130 Inf.	1232	31	16	B
Thompson, Oscar L.	Pvt. Co. H, 130 Inf.	1232	27	15	D
Haessly, Harry J.	Pvt. Co. C, 131 Inf.	636	7	25	C
Haugrud, Oscar O.	Pvt. Co. K, 131 Inf.	636	16	17	C
Howe, Earl J.	Pvt. Co. D, 131 Inf.	1232	7	8	A
Kyle, Cecil F.	Sgt. Co. B, 131 Inf.	1232	31	20	A
Lampo, Edw. M.	Pvt. Co. D, 131 Inf.	1232	37	28	A
Larson, Benmote O.	Pvt. Co. K, 131 Inf.	1232	9	28	H
Loken, John	do.	1232	9	28	H
Rinnick, Harold C.	Pvt. Co. G, 131 Inf.	636	4	18	D
Olson, Walter A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 131 Inf.	1232	27	9	F
Week, Alfred	Pvt. Co. H, 131 Inf.	636	4	19	C
Barstad, John M.	Pvt. Co. F, 132 Inf.	1232	22	9	C
Butler, David W.	Pvt. Co. H, 132 Inf.	1232	11	7	B
Lindbloom, Gustave	Pvt. Co. D, 132 Inf.	1232	11	33	A
O'Brien, Jas.	Pvt. Co. H, 132 Inf.	1232	18	39	A
Olson, Emil J.	Pvt. Co. I, 132 Inf.	1232	16	1	C
Poston, Geo. S.	Pvt. Co. L, 132 Inf.	1232	10	27	F
Romoso, Anton	Pvt. Co. L, 132 Inf.	636	5	19	D
Scherppa, Felix	Pvt. Co. M, 132 Inf.	1232	7	36	B
Swanson, Carl E.	Pvt. Co. K, 132 Inf.	1232	14	42	A
Wold, Melvin	Pvt. Co. F, 132 Inf.	1232	18	1	B
Anderson, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 124 M. G. Bn.	1233	31	15	D
Carlson, Alex	Pvt. Co. E, 137 Inf.	1233	5	21	A
Casebeer, Fred	do.	1232	34	39	H
Larson, John F. L.	do.	608	23	36	A
Nordin, Edw. C.	Pvt. Co. B, 137 Inf.	1232	10	34	A
Orlandech, John	Pvt. Co. M, 137 Inf.	1232	17	34	F
Tibbling, Reuben O.	Pvt. Co. A, 137 Inf.	1232	7	33	D
Zimmer, Ernest W.	do.	1232	30	20	D
Anderson, Nels L.	Pvt. Co. I, 138 Inf.	1232	36	12	C
Davis, Bernard F.	do.	1232	6	16	C
Dworsky, Edw. J.	Pvt. Co. G, 138 Inf.	608	29	38	B
Machovec, Leo R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 138 Inf.	1233	18	8	C
Roth, Chas. J.	Sgt. Co. F, 138 Inf.	1232	34	26	G
Swanson, Chas.	Pvt. Co. I, 138 Inf.	1232	23	43	F
Wolbeck, Frank	do.	1232	17	1	E
Ahl, Gust E.	Pvt. Co. B, 139 Inf.	1232	37	15	D
Bonnes, Olof E.	Pvt. Co. D, 139 Inf.	1232	34	25	B
Dale, Martin H.	Pvt. Co. E, 139 Inf.	1232	19	13	C
Gustafson, David A.	Pvt. Co. K, 139 Inf.	1232	30	15	C
Hill, Wm. C.	Pvt. Co. C, 139 Inf.	1232	20	6	C
Johnson, Geo. C.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 139 Inf.	1233	20	8	C
McCaffrey, John F.	do.	1233	20	20	C
Nagel, Albert L.	Pvt. Co. E, 139 Inf.	1232	23	33	C
Oswald, Wm. M.	do.	1232	38	33	C
Qual, Robt.	Pvt. Co. F, 139 Inf.	1232	26	7	E
Sharkey, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. M, 139 Inf.	1232	3	10	H
Stebler, Louis E.	Pvt. Co. I, 139 Inf.	636	3	11	B
Stowers, Walter C.	Pvt. Co. D, 139 Inf.	1232	17	38	E
Svenson, Wilhelm	do.	1232	7	23	D
Welliver, Delbert M.	Pvt. Co. F, 139 Inf.	1232	4	7	H
Beall, Cambridge G.	Pvt. Co. A, 140 Inf.	1232	2	12	C
Runnie, Clarence R.	Pvt. Co. G, 140 Inf.	1232	18	6	C
Solvskar, Torgus	Pvt. Co. I, 140 Inf.	1233	6	23	D
THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Peterson, Oscar E.	Pvt. Co. F, 144 Inf.	1233	5	4	A
THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Fossum, Wm. T.	Pvt. Co. M, 148 Inf.	1252	15	2	A
Fruth, Norbeth L.	Pvt. Co. F, 148 Inf.	1252	14	4	D
Huovinen, Jacob	Pvt. Co. L, 148 Inf.	1252	12	2	A
Iverson, John	Pvt. Co. B, 148 Inf.	1252	13	4	D
Johnson, Axel B.	Pvt. Co. G, 148 Inf.	1252	18	1	C
Norris, Marius	Pvt. Co. I, 148 Inf.	1252	4	21	D
Perone, John	Pvt. Co. B, 148 Inf.	1252	12	1	A
Taberman, Arthur J.	Pvt. Co. M, 148 Inf.	636	3	3	A
Wilson, John L.	do.	1252	19	1	A
Wold, John	Pvt. Co. K, 148 Inf.	1252	19	4	D
Fladhammer, Alfred	Pvt. Co. B, 136 M. G. Bn.	1233	31	25	D
THIRTY-NINTH DIVISION					
Heim, Harry R.	1 lt. Co. A, 114 Engrs.	1233	18	5	A
FORTIETH DIVISION					
Fraser, Arthur D.	Pvt. Co. M, 157 Inf.	1233	11	20	A
Lahti, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. L, 159 Inf.	1233	3	4	C

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FORTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Chatterton, Charlie H.	Sgt. Co. E, 163 Inf.	608	21	12	A
Ryan, Timothy F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty F, 148 F. A.	608	19	29	B
Shannon, Robt. J.	Pvt. Co. K, 116 Engrs.	608	28	30	B
FORTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Borgen, Andrew E.	Pvt. Co. A, 165 Inf.	1232	31	36	H
Dell, Elmer J.	do	1232	33	35	F
Hogan, Harold J.	Pvt. Co. C, 165 Inf.	1232	5	31	B
Jeno, Wilfred.	Pvt. Co. A, 165 Inf.	608	14	1	B
Johnson, Geo. A.	do	608	34	13	C
Kennedy, Geo. F.	do	1232	39	32	E
Moreau, Louis E.	Pvt. Co. F, 165 Inf.	608	6	8	B
Novak, Frank L.	do	608	12	12	B
Smith, Geo. L.	Pvt. Co. H, 165 Inf.	608	6	9	B
Collins, Roy E.	Pvt. Co. M, 168 Inf.	1232	38	29	B
Fox, Jos. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 166 Inf.	1232	24	33	E
Hanson, Roy L.	do	1764	66	8	A
Johnson, Ingbert M.	Pvt. Co. L, 166 Inf.	608	15	8	A
Lampert, Robt. A.	Pvt. Co. G, 166 Inf.	608	4	9	B
Hosher, Jos. A.	Pvt. Co. H, 166 Inf.	608	10	1	B
Hebert, Earl B.	Pvt. Co. M, 168 Inf.	1232	25	15	H
Allie, Francis.	Pvt. Co. B, 151 F. A.	1764	23	7	A
Buckley, Walter H.	Cpl. Co. E, 151 F. A.	608	22	16	C
Christie, John S.	Sgt. Co. C, 151 F. A.	1232	40	14	D
Lajdlaw, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 151 F. A.	1232	22	11	H
Lorenz, Grant W.	Pvt. M. D. 151 F. A.	608	25	25	A
McArthur, Chas. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 151 F. A.	1232	7	30	C
Nelson, Lester N.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 151 F. A.	1232	37	5	H
York, Guy E.	Cpl. Co. E, 151 F. A.	1232	9	45	D
SEVENTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Simmons, Jedediah R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A, 303 F. A.	1233	15	14	D
SEVENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Arkman, Frank	Pvt. Co. L, 305 Inf.	1232	28	32	F
Larson, Martin	do	1232	4	16	C
Lucma, Sam	do	1232	19	9	F
Lund, Soren	Pvt. Co. M, 305 Inf.	1232	38	20	D
Hanson, Alfred M.	Pvt. Co. D, 306 Inf.	1232	14	26	G
Hughes, Peter E.	Pvt. Co. L, 306 Inf.	1232	40	6	C
McCarthy, Howard T.	Pvt. Co. G, 306 Inf.	1232	6	14	E
Robinson, Chas. A.	Pvt. Co. K, 306 Inf.	1232	37	11	H
Anderson, Oscar P.	Pvt. Co. C, 307 Inf.	1232	13	34	H
Davis, Ephraim J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 307 Inf.	608	30	5	C
Haug, Gunder	Pvt. Co. E, 307 Inf.	1764	35	12	B
Hendrickson, Alfred J.	Pvt. Co. K, 307 Inf.	1232	18	22	B
Johnson, Johan A.	Pvt. Co. H, 307 Inf.	1232	7	19	H
Kobernat, Jas. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 307 Inf.	1232	21	18	B
Larson, Henry	Pvt. Co. L, 307 Inf.	608	6	39	D
Lekan, Mike	Wag. Co. K, 307 Inf.	1232	39	2	B
Leyendecker, Thos.	Pvt. Co. L, 307 Inf.	1232	21	2	D
Olsen, Hans H. E.	Pvt. Co. A, 307 Inf.	1232	4	34	D
Oseltus, Hjalmar J.	Pvt. Co. L, 307 Inf.	1232	39	5	H
Palmer, Albin F.	Pvt. Co. H, 307 Inf.	1232	28	32	H
Skogen, Edwin B.	Pvt. Co. L, 307 Inf.	1232	38	6	H
Steiner, Albert C.	Pvt. Co. E, 307 Inf.	1232	38	3	F
Stender, John H.	Pvt. Co. D, 307 Inf.	1232	35	34	B
Swenson, Horace A.	Pvt. Co. C, 307 Inf.	1232	5	32	H
Artwine, Joe	Pvt. Co. K, 308 Inf.	1232	25	14	H
Bakker, Dick W.	Pvt. Co. E, 308 Inf.	1232	5	16	B
Blackwood, Robt.	Pvt. Co. K, 308 Inf.	608	13	15	D
Buth, Harry O.	Pvt. Co. H, 308 Inf.	1232	34	2	B
Evenson, Ed.	Pvt. Co. M, 308 Inf.	1232	30	29	E
Hanson, Theodore	Pvt. Co. H, 308 Inf.	1232	35	8	B
Manthey, Albert M. S.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 308 Inf.	1232	16	26	B
Matejcek, Hugo W.	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	1232	38	16	H
Mattson, Wm.	Pvt. Co. E, 308 Inf.	1232	40	23	B
Osttun, Conrad N.	Pvt. Co. K, 308 Inf.	608	27	20	A
Otto, Herman A.	Pvt. Co. I, 308 Inf.	1232	19	1	A
Rehmann, Albert	do	1232	30	5	H
Richardson, John W.	do	1232	8	27	G
Roddewig, John	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	1232	38	27	D
Rye, Robt. J.	Pvt. Co. M, 308 Inf.	1232	36	27	D
Spiektoszer, Ferdi-	Pvt. Co. K, 308 Inf.	1232	4	40	H
Stydzinski, Jos.	Pvt. Co. A, 308 Inf.	1232	31	1	G
Tollefson, Theodore	Pvt. Hq. Co., 308 Inf.	1232	34	9	B
Gaughn, Thos. J.	Pvt. Bty. C, 304 F. A.	608	9	25	C
Olson, Eric	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C, 304 F. A.	608	19	5	C
Peeha, Gust	Pvt. Hq. Co., 304 F. A.	1232	15	21	D
Pierson, Owen C.	Pvt. Bty. C, 304 F. A.	608	17	13	A
Swenson, Walter R.	Pvt. Bty. F, 304 F. A.	608	25	10	D
Tollefson, Herman P.	Pvt. Bty. C, 304 F. A.	1233	20	20	B
Aasgaard, Almer M.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 305 F. A.	608	11	7	D
Jackson, Jacob E.	Wag. Sup. Co., 305 F. A.	608	19	7	D
Lindblom, Henry	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E, 306 F. A.	1232	19	23	D
Pederson, Johnny	Pvt. 302 Trn. Mts. Bty.	1233	32	24	A
Polldorf, Nono	do	608	13	10	C
Geer, Samuel	Pvt. Co. C, 302 Engrs.	1252	8	31	E
SEVENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION					
Appelen, Ernest	Pvt. Co. B, 309 Inf.	1232	14	26	B
Gardewine, Raymond	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 309 Inf.	1232	26	23	C
Johnson, Knute S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 309 Inf.	1232	35	15	B
Kelash, Frank	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 309 Inf.	1232	18	17	B
Lundstrom, Charlie	Pvt. Co. E, 309 Inf.	1232	39	1	A
Michalski, Wm.	Pvt. Co. D, 309 Inf.	1232	33	14	B
Peterson, Oscar E.	Pvt. Co. F, 309 Inf.	1232	31	15	B
Peterson, Walter	Pvt. Co. I, 309 Inf.	1232	31	32	G
Stone, Kendall P.	Pvt. Co. K, 309 Inf.	1764	39	11	B
Viken, Jos. A.	Pvt. Co. F, 309 Inf.	1233	22	1	C

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SEVENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION—continued					
Woebkenberg, Fred	Cpl. Co. D, 309 Inf.	1232	33	13	A
Youngberg, Henry W.	Pvt. Co. M, 309 Inf.	1232	18	27	B
Albertson, Carl O.	Pvt. Co. M, 310 Inf.	1232	21	8	B
Johnson, Frank F.	Pvt. Co. K, 310 Inf.	1232	17	19	D
Larson, Norman	Pvt. Co. I, 310 Inf.	1232	16	11	E
Robertson, Albert C.	Pvt. Co. D, 310 Inf.	1232	38	7	A
Snell, Stephen	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 310 Inf.	1232	17	11	G
Unger, Ernest	Pvt. Co. C, 310 Inf.	1232	11	42	F
Zimmerman, Edw. Geo.	Pvt. Co. A, 310 Inf.	1232	38	10	B
Cantu, Peter Edw.	Pvt. Co. B, 311 Inf.	1232	40	14	F
Foss, Harry A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 311 Inf.	1232	33	16	B
Joyce, Thos. J.	Pvt. Co. I, 311 Inf.	1232	5	26	C
Nomeland, Jim J.	Pvt. Co. D, 311 Inf.	1232	21	9	B
Ongstad, Henry T.	Pvt. Co. A, 311 Inf.	1232	35	2	B
Anderson, Alfred A.	Pvt. Co. A, 312 Inf.	1232	38	28	B
Baker, John T.	do	1232	5	12	E
Kramer, Julius J.	Pvt. Co. F, 312 Inf.	1232	22	32	E
Nassen, Ernest C.	Pvt. Co. I, 312 Inf.	1232	38	25	F
Nelson, Hans	Pvt. Co. M, 312 Inf.	1232	29	2	B
Senkyr, Frank G.	Pvt. Co. D, 312 Inf.	1232	38	13	C
King, Emil	1 lt. 303 San. Tn.	1233	14	7	B
Mann, Wm. F.	Pvt. Co. K, 315 Inf.	1232	8	34	E
Petersen, Harold	Cpl. Co. B, 304 F. S. Bn.	1233	22	9	B
Peterson, Henning O.	Pvt. Co. C, 304 F. S. Bn.	1232	11	25	C
EIGHTIETH DIVISION					
Berglin, John E.	Pvt. Co. C, 317 Inf.	1232	17	24	G
Strand, John B.	Pvt. Co. K, 317 Inf.	1232	1	8	D
Nelson, Axel Emanuel	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 320 Inf.	1233	17	5	B
EIGHTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Lohrke, Herman	Pvt. Co. K, 321 Inf.	1232	26	23	F
Swanman, Leslie S.	Pvt. Co. A, 324 Inf.	1232	39	42	A
Swanson, Edw. B.	do	1233	29	24	D
EIGHTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Burud, Charley B.	Pvt. Co. F, 325 Inf.	1232	30	24	C
Frondal, Gilbert	Pvt. Co. I, 325 Inf.	1232	20	5	E
Hendershot, Louis H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 325 Inf.	1233	19	13	B
Henkemeyer, John G.	Pvt. Co. D, 325 Inf.	1232	5	15	G
Miennert, Frank A.	Pvt. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	10	5	E
Reed, Allan G.	Pvt. Co. D, 325 Inf.	1232	26	4	E
Wachholz, Herman C.	Pvt. Co. A, 325 Inf.	1232	36	12	B
Courbot, Leon E.	Pvt. Co. C, 325 Inf.	1232	1	12	E
Hannula, John	Pvt. Co. G, 326 Inf.	1233	5	8	C
Hendrickson, Otto	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 326 Inf.	1232	38	8	H
Jendro, Paul	Pvt. Co. K, 326 Inf.	1232	19	19	C
Johnson, Andrew T.	Pvt. Co. E, 326 Inf.	1232	6	9	E
Bohis, John F.	Sgt. Co. A, 327 Inf.	1232	10	27	C
Johnson, Oscar	Pvt. Co. A, 327 Inf.	1252	1	9	E
Latendresse, Albert P.	do	1232	25	9	C
Lundberg, Frank H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 327 Inf.	1233	32	11	D
Myhre, Melvin	Pvt. Co. M, 327 Inf.	1232	26	8	B
Olson, Olaf	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 327 Inf.	1233	14	10	D
Buens, Thos. M.	Pvt. Co. M, 328 Inf.	1232	9	36	F
Impola, John W.	Pvt. Co. L, 328 Inf.	1232	26	16	G
Martinson, Albert	Cpl. Co. B, 328 Inf.	1232	4	12	D
Peteruka, Elia	Pvt. Co. E, 328 Inf.	1232	27	42	F
Phillips, Nick M.	do	1232	6	10	H
Richter, Fred	Pvt. Co. C, 328 Inf.	1232	32	27	E
Tygus, Gustave	Cpl. Co. C, 328 Inf.	1232	7	7	C
Nielsen, Adolph M.	Pvt. Co. B, 319 M. G. Bn.	1233	7	19	A
Nissen, John A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 320 M. G. Bn.	34	32	7	A
Peterson, Wm. F.	Pvt. Co. A, 520 M. G. Bn.	1232	19	32	C
Fossum, Binar	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 307 Engrs.	1232	13	10	C
Hendricks, Gordon S.	Wag. Co. B, 307 Amm. Tn.	1233	20	19	B
EIGHTY-THIRD DIVISION					
Keller, Roy H.	Pvt. Co. C, 323 M. G. Bn.	608	17	27	D
EIGHTY-FOURTH DIVISION					
Paulson, Helmer	Pvt. Co. E, 336 Inf.	107-E	8	1	D
Moe, Emil	Pvt. Co. A, 326 M. G. Bn.	608	3	27	B
EIGHTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Anderson, Axel G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co. 341 Inf.	34	24	2	A
Diederichs, Carl	Pvt. Co. A, 341 Inf.	34	35	3	A
Knaus, Jos.	Pvt. Co. C, 341 Inf.	34	9	22	A
Lee, Helmer	Pvt. Co. L, 341 Inf.	34	31	14	A
Aussant, Chas.	Pvt. Co. B, 342 Inf.	34	14	20	A
Knaus, Ludwig Godfrey	Pvt. M. G. Co. 342 Inf.	107-E	12	2	B
McDunn, Giles B.	Pvt. Co. A, 342 Inf.	34	28	2	A
Wileox, Ralph O.	Pvt. Co. B, 342 Inf.	608	23	18	D
Arbelus, Robt.	Pvt. Co. E, 343 Inf.	34	1	6	A
Brown, Bernard	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 342 Inf.	107-E	3	1	A
Gray, Gideon	Pvt. Co. K, 343 Inf.	107-E	8	3	B
Jorgenson, Emil	Pvt. Co. L, 343 Inf.	107-E	7	5	C
Nielsen, Carl V.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co. 343 Inf.	34	8	4	A
Nieminen, Michael	Pvt. Co. E, 343 Inf.	34	16	9	A
Piquette, Geo. Theodore	Pvt. Co. B, 343 Inf.	107-E	3	5	C
Sabrowsky, Emil Herman	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 343 Inf.	107-E	13	2	D
Slotsve, Henry	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 343 Inf.	107-E	8	7	C
Stahl, Geo. Jos.	Pvt. Co. M, 343 Inf.	107-E	14	3	C
Westrum, Alvin Oris	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 343 Inf.	107-E	6	6	D
Gilroy, Francis Richard	Pvt. Co. B, 332 M. G. Bn.	107-E	8	5	A

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
EIGHTY-SIXTH DIVISION—continued					
Nelson, Alfred	Pvt. Co. A, 332 M. G. Bn.	107-E	17	5	C
Hansen, Geo. A.	Pvt. Co. D, 333 M. G. Bn.	107-E	6	5	C
Anderson, Nels	Pvt. Bty. E, 331 F. A.	107-E	14	2	B
Momyr, Alfred	Pvt. Bty. C, 331 F. A.	107-E	2	2	B
Schultz, Wm. Adolph	Pvt. Bty. E, 331 F. A.	107-E	9	4	B
Larson, Fred John	Pvt. Bty. D, 332 F. A.	34	6	12	A
Sauer, Art. N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E, 332 F. A.	34	20	5	A
Christopherson, Earl Otis	Pvt. Hq. Co. 333 F. A.	34	32	12	A
Larson, Eddie	Pvt. 311 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	636	8	12	A
Olsen, Louis	do.	636	13	21	A
Anderson, Oscar E.	Pvt. Co. D, 311 Engrs.	34	18	14	A
Graden, John	Pvt. Co. B, 311 Engrs.	34	9	8	A
Johnson, Isaac Martin	Pvt. Co. A, 311 Engrs.	34	39	7	A
Hanson, Ludvig	Pvt. Co. E, 311 Amm. Tn.	608	7	27	A
Miller, Henry Albert	Pvt. 341 F. H. 311 San. Tn.	107-E	10	5	C
EIGHTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Bastmann, Johannes G.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 346 Inf.	34	29	3	C
Whitmore, Don A.	Sgt. Co. B, 348 Inf.	608	2	23	B
McKenney, Alfred W.	Wag. 312 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	34	24	4	A
Crowe, Thos. F.	Cpl. Co. C, 312 Engrs.	34	11	5	A
Halverson, Andrew N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 312 F. S. Bn.	34	9	3	C
Keiser, Andrew	Sgt. Co. D, 312 Amm. Tn.	34	11	12	A
EIGHTY-EIGHTH DIVISION					
Cullen, Frank M.	Pvt. Co. D, 349 Inf.	1232	35	25	F
Sutherland, John R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 349 Inf.	1232	37	28	D
Brown, Vivus W.	Pvt. Co. B, 350 Inf.	1232	26	26	E
Sather, Bernhard	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 352 Inf.	1232	37	45	D
Jackson, Wm. G.	Pvt. Co. G, 339 M. G. Bn.	1232	16	23	H
Wesa, Arthur J.	Pvt. Bty. E, 337 F. A.	1764	1	8	B
Heison, Otto	Pvt. Bty. A, 339 F. A.	1764	6	8	B
Honeyman, Bruce R.	Capt. Co. A, 313 Engrs.	1232	30	23	E
Swenson, Alfred M.	Capt. 313 Engrs.	34	2	5	B
Schroeder, Alois T.	Hrshr. Co. E, 313 Amm. Tn.	1232	20	44	A
Sovich, Geo. M.	Pvt. Co. E, 313 Amm. Tn.	1232	6	39	D
Anderson, Harold	Pvt. Co. M, 353 Inf.	1232	38	31	D
Johnson, Leonard	Cpl. Co. A, 353 Inf.	1232	8	44	D
Keller, Ignatz	Pvt. Co. E, 353 Inf.	1232	35	41	A
Kronloeken, John	Pvt. Co. L, 353 Inf.	1232	20	32	A
Schultz, Fred J.	Pvt. Co. H, 353 Inf.	1232	33	17	A
Zabroki, Stanley B.	Pvt. Co. K, 353 Inf.	1232	4	17	C
Zenk, Leo Leander	Pvt. Co. M, 353 Inf.	1232	32	12	B
Bomsta, Max B.	Pvt. Co. F, 354 Inf.	1232	40	11	C
Buberger, Fredk. C.	Pvt. Co. A, 354 Inf.	1232	28	4	C
Grothe, Martin	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 354 Inf.	1232	9	21	F
Jensen, Herman G.	Mech. Co. K, 354 Inf.	1232	23	3	D
Lampe, Chris H.	Pvt. Co. E, 354 Inf.	1232	31	11	B
McCormick, Martin	Pvt. Co. G, 354 Inf.	1232	35	30	H
Menzel, Edward	Pvt. Co. B, 354 Inf.	1232	29	32	E
Ostlund, Andrew J.	Pvt. Co. G, 354 Inf.	1232	32	25	A
Jensen, Tineus J.	Pvt. Co. D, 341 M. G. Bn.	1232	11	28	C
Moyer, Howard W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 342 M. G. Bn.	1232	21	9	D
NINETEENTH DIVISION					
Adams, Carl A.	Pvt. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	12	46	C
Ahern, Arthur Edw.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 357 Inf.	1232	23	34	D
Besserud, Lewis E.	Pvt. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	32	15	C
Bratsch, Paul E.	Pvt. Co. A, 357 Inf.	1232	22	12	B
Budahl, Peter G.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 357 Inf.	1232	13	4	E
Cedarholm, Louis M.	Pvt. Co. M, 357 Inf.	1232	33	3	C
Church, Geo. B.	do.	1232	17	16	B
Clark, Geo. B.	Pvt. Co. D, 357 Inf.	1232	33	23	G
DePerry, Antoine J.	Pvt. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	23	7	D
Enright, Michael D.	do.	1232	4	15	B
Ferguson, Chas.	Pvt. Co. K, 357 Inf.	1232	15	40	A
Hovland, Helmer	Pvt. Co. A, 357 Inf.	1232	10	14	B
Hurley, Jas. T.	Cpl. Co. D, 357 Inf.	1232	6	45	A
ckson, Geo.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 357 Inf.	1232	31	11	G
Jarvi, Edward	Pvt. Co. A, 357 Inf.	1232	19	18	D
Jendro, Steve	do.	1232	4	10	F
Johnson, Herman	Pvt. Co. G, 357 Inf.	1232	23	27	D
Langer, Victor B.	do.	608	4	21	B
Lebeck, Melvin R.	Pvt. Co. K, 357 Inf.	1232	38	36	D
Lundholm, Chester	Pvt. Co. C, 357 Inf.	1232	26	13	C
Nairn, Geo. Ellis	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	24	26	C
Nilsson, Johan	Pvt. Co. C, 357 Inf.	1232	16	3	D
Nykreim, Sophus M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	28	46	C
Olson, Jack	Pvt. Co. A, 357 Inf.	1232	30	3	H
Olson, Ole M.	Pvt. Co. C, 357 Inf.	1232	3	24	D
Olson, Olof	Pvt. Co. E, 357 Inf.	1232	24	7	B
Rosser, Charley	Pvt. Co. C, 357 Inf.	1232	12	8	C
Rothie, Wm.	Pvt. Co. G, 357 Inf.	1232	13	28	C
Solie, Henry	Mech. Co. C, 357 Inf.	1232	35	24	A
Bakken, Oscar C.	Pvt. Co. D, 358 Inf.	1232	40	17	E
Bannick, Frank J.	Pvt. Co. C, 358 Inf.	1232	15	24	B
Berg, Wm. E.	do.	1232	24	7	D
Borak, Chas.	Pvt. Co. E, 358 Inf.	1232	22	2	C
Gorkow, John H.	Cpl. Co. D, 358 Inf.	1232	31	2	R
Hoopes, Harold E.	Pvt. Co. E, 358 Inf.	1232	4	32	B
Johnson, Lewis C.	Cpl. Co. B, 358 Inf.	1232	16	46	C
Larson, Geo. H.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 358 Inf.	1232	34	29	G
Lee, Roy	Pvt. Co. B, 358 Inf.	1232	36	14	H
Milli, Lorenz	Pvt. Co. G, 358 Inf.	1232	22	13	F
Overlie, Orin A.	do.	1232	20	22	C
Paquin, Isadore Joe	Pvt. Co. C, 358 Inf.	1232	18	24	B
Pearson, Erick G.	Pvt. Co. I, 358 Inf.	1232	14	10	A
Podgerski, Frank	Pvt. Co. C, 358 Inf.	1232	13	22	G

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NINETEENTH DIVISION—continued					
Saari, Yalmer	Pvt. Co. D, 358 Inf.	1232	18	28	B
Scharfbillig, Frank J.	Pvt. Co. B, 358 Inf.	1232	11	13	B
Warren, Clifford L.	Pvt. Co. D, 358 Inf.	1232	33	2	D
Young, Chauncey	Pvt. Co. B, 358 Inf.	1232	23	46	C
Zeaman, Eddie	Pvt. Co. D, 358 Inf.	1232	6	28	B
Carlson, Thure W. M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 359 Inf.	1232	15	32	D
Coussemeier, Henry	Pvt. Co. E, 359 Inf.	1232	24	15	D
Grosse, Edmund P.	Pvt. Co. H, 359 Inf.	1232	3	24	C
Johnson, Carl P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 359 Inf.	1232	33	27	C
Knoll, Frank J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 359 Inf.	1232	32	14	D
Kruger, Walter F.	Pvt. Co. F, 359 Inf.	1232	25	8	B
Mathies, Wilfred	Pvt. Co. H, 359 Inf.	1232	4	18	B
Muller, Eco H.	Pvt. Co. K, 359 Inf.	1232	22	24	C
Roering, Ben	Pvt. Co. A, 359 Inf.	1232	32	8	B
Scholz, Gerhard H.	Pvt. Co. H, 359 Inf.	1232	15	23	B
Yoeckel, Clarence E.	Pvt. Co. D, 359 Inf.	1232	23	10	A
Alsen, Ole C.	Pvt. Co. M, 360 Inf.	1232	21	38	G
Yelland, John H.	Pvt. Co. I, 360 Inf.	1232	5	43	A
Carlson, Julius	do.	1232	36	28	E
Danielson, Melvin C.	Pvt. Co. B, 360 Inf.	34	36	4	F
Fairbanks, Geo. F.	Pvt. Co. F, 360 Inf.	1232	8	41	F
Fosmbs, Berut A.	Pvt. Co. I, 360 Inf.	1232	28	10	B
Huber, Jos. L.	Pvt. Co. E, 360 Inf.	1232	23	16	C
Johnson, Carl F.	Pvt. Co. G, 360 Inf.	1232	21	20	A
Malmgren, Nels	Pvt. Co. B, 360 Inf.	1232	8	22	C
Myrin, Harry	Pvt. Co. G, 360 Inf.	1232	19	5	A
Quigley, Howard C.	Pvt. Co. D, 360 Inf.	1232	20	3	A
Rubin, Alfred	Pvt. Co. G, 360 Inf.	1232	32	33	D
Pohl, Ralph L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 345 M. G. Bn.	1232	6	8	A
Sollom, Gustav A.	Pvt. Co. B, 345 M. G. Bn.	1232	11	18	B
Harrison, Ervie W.	Pvt. Co. E, 315 Engrs.	1232	24	12	D
NINETY-FIRST DIVISION					
Barthle, Albert L.	Pvt. Co. L, 362 Inf.	1232	22	18	F
Carlson, Edward	Pvt. Co. C, 362 Inf.	1232	22	40	G
Elison, John	Pvt. M. G. Co. 362 Inf.	34	1	17	A
Odegaard, Albert	Pvt. Co. A, 362 Inf.	1232	4	30	D
Rydell, Axel T.	Pvt. Co. L, 362 Inf.	1232	14	1	D
Terrill, John M.	Pvt. Co. F, 362 Inf.	1232	29	42	E
Christensen, Saml. J.	Pvt. Co. C, 363 Inf.	1232	24	21	B
Garrison, Job A.	Pvt. Co. F, 363 Inf.	107-E	8	38	A
Johnson, David F.	Pvt. Co. G, 363 Inf.	1232	4	1	D
Kicker, Emil A.	Pvt. Co. M, 363 Inf.	1232	22	40	H
Paarmann, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. I, 363 Inf.	1232	37	4	C
Westerberg, Irvin A.	Pvt. Co. L, 363 Inf.	1232	17	33	A
Bortie, Oscar B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 364 Inf.	1232	22	43	A
Hagestande, Siver	Pvt. Co. G, 364 Inf.	1332	4	4	D
NINETY-THIRD DIVISION					
Harris, Clark M.	Pvt. Co. C, 369 Inf.	1232	12	26	G
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS					
Golden, Chas.	Sgt. Sup. Co. 5, Army Cps.	1232	33	31	A
Wold, Ernest G.	1 lt., 1 Aero Sq.	1764	60	10	B
Roth, Irving J.	1 lt., 49 Aero Sq.	1232	2	21	F
Cutter, Edw. B.	1 lt., 90 Aero Sq.	1232	12	21	F
Moody, Richard Wil-	2 lt., 129 Aero Sq.	608	22	5	A
lard.					
Gallagher, Barney J.	Sgt. 1 cl., 273 Aero Sq.	107-E	13	3	B
Campbell, Chas. (alias Douglas, Chas.)	Sgt. 341 Aero Sq.	34	15	4	C
Squire, Yale H.	1 lt. 2 Avi. Instr. Ctr.	608	27	9	C
Edmondson, Walter O.	1 lt. Cas. Air Serv.	34	25	4	B
Kingsley, Kenneth F.	Pvt. Hq. Det., 32 C. A. C. Brig.	608	7	31	A
Johnson, Otto M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D, 44 C. A. C. Regt.	1232	30	16	B
Carlson, Oscar C.	Wag. Bty. E, 45 C. A. C. Regt.	34	29	2	A
Orlande, Morris I.	Pvt. Bty. B, 51 C. A. C. Regt.	1232	16	2	B
Johnson, Fritz	Pvt. Bty. A, 70 C. A. C.	608	19	21	A
Gustofson, Robt. H.	Pvt. Bty. A, 73 C. A. C.	608	20	19	D
Medinnis, Chas.	1 lt. Hq. Co. 3 Bn., 75 C. A. C.	608	37	31	D
Jacobson, Harry	Pvt. Bty. A, 3 Cp. Art. Pk.	34	17	6	C
Nelson, Harry L.	Pvt. Co. A, 3 Cp. Art. Pk.	34	24	3	C
Ramberg, Oscar	Pvt. Bty. A, 3 Cp. Art. Pk.	34	12	2	C
Searl, Percy T.	Pvt. Bty. B, 3 Cp. Art. Pk.	34	28	5	O
Miller, Eddie B.	Pvt. Am. Co., 11 M. D.	1232	27	6	A
Donaldson, Glenn S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Sec. 606 U. S. A. Serv.	1232	38	31	E
Gammell, Warren S.	Sgt. 1 cl. U. S. A. Sec. 508	1232	1	3	C
Lubrecht, Wm. A.	Pvt. Evac. Hosp. 1 M. D.	1232	9	28	D
Jansen, Clarence J.	Pvt. 1 cl. A. R. C. Hosp. 2, M. D.	34	12	14	B
VanLeanen, John V.	Pvt. Cent. Laboratory, M. D.	608	25	19	D
Amundson, Esther	Nurse B. II 35 A. N. C.	1232	25	18	C
Anderson, Nora E.	Nurse B. H. 68 A. N. C.	1232	30	11	A
Kimball, Florence	Nurse B. H. 22 A. N. C.	34	8	3	O
McCahill, Louis	Cpl. 425 Mtr. Tk. Co. 412 M. T. C.	34	5	4	A
Ward, John H.	Pvt. 1 cl. 452 Mt. Tk. Co. M. T. C.	608	38	31	B
Anderson, Adolph R.	Pvt. Ord. Dept.	(1)			
Broderick, Arthur L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Ord. Dept.	34	14	16	B

1 Civilian cemetery, Saumur, Maine-et-Loire, France.

Deceased soldiers from Minnesota buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—CON.					
Crocker, Wilbert W.	Pvt. 1 Prov. Ord. Regt.	608	18	13	C
Witkowski, John	Pvt. 1 cl. 1 Cav. Trn. Tp.	608	32	35	B
Duggan, Arthur J.	Sgt. 1 cl. 2 Cp. Gas Sch.	1233	8	9	B
	C. W. S.				
Ludolph, Martin H.	Cpl. Co. A, F. A. Sch. Det.	608	32	20	C
Morey, Harvey W.	Pvt. J. A. R. D. Cp. Cody	608	32	4	A
	F. A.				
Henry, Abraham	Pvt. Co. D, 49 Inf.	608	18	10	D
Fraun, Geo. J.	Pvt. Co. B, 4 A. A. M. G.	1233	16	16	B
	Bn.				
Wollum, Edw. L.	Pvt. Co. A, 4 A. A. M. G.	1233	20	9	B
	Bn.				
Anderson, Alfred J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 3 Pion. Inf.	608	21	14	C
Ascher, Herman Theo-	Pvt. Hq. Co., 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	7	27	H
dore.					
Curtin, John J.	Pvt. Co. H, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	19	40	C
Fallon, Bernard	Pvt. Co. K, 3 Pion. Inf.	34	28	2	B
Fraser, Monta	Pvt. Co. B, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	25	13	H
Golen, Frederick S.	Pvt. Co. F, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	12	23	H
Gravell, Louis J.	Pvt. Co. L, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	33	10	H
Hansen, Wm.	do.	1233	36	7	A
Hood, Arthur M.	do.	1232	23	2	H
Kaniewski, Stanley	Sgt. Co. G, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	10	31	F
Edw.					
Kratzke, Edw. C.	Pvt. Co. G, 3 Pion. Inf.	1233	8	17	C
Looff, Walter W.	Pvt. Co. M, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	18	28	F
McKean, Roy	do.	1233	5	17	B
Schneiderman, Henry	Pvt. Co. K, 3 Pion. Inf.	1233	10	13	A
Schulz, Alfred Herman	Pvt. Co. B, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	5	22	F
Woytke, Robt. M.	Cpl. Co. C, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	27	2	H
Zeehes, Edw. Jacob	do.	1232	24	13	H
Moline, Oscar M.	Pvt. Co. D, 53 Pion. Inf.	34	32	1	A
Ahneman, Geo. Frank	Pvt. Co. E, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	4	18	A
Albers, Walter J.	Pvt. Co. K, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	16	37	H
Beck, Chas. P.	Pvt. Co. E, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	20	14	F
Cromen, John	do.	1232	39	33	A
Engelbreton, Ole E.	Pvt. Co. D, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	13	17	D
Engen, Jergen	Pvt. Co. K, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	15	22	D
Herbman, Emil	Pvt. Co. E, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	8	20	F
Jensen, Elmer L.	Pvt. Co. L, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	14	43	D
Johansson, Carl Geo.	Pvt. Sup. Co., 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	14	18	H
Johnson, John A.	Pvt. Co. M, 54 Pion. Inf.	1764	13	11	B
Lindgren, August V.	Pvt. Co. E, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	33	11	A
Lindquist, Rudolph M.	Pvt. Co. H, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	10	7	B
Marsh, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. F, 54 Pion. Inf.	34	16	8	A
Martinson, Ole	Cpl. Co. D, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	26	18	A
Mathiason, Frank Ar-	Pvt. Co. C, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	6	17	D
thur.					
Myhre, Peter	Pvt. Co. D, 54 Pion. Inf.	1233	17	19	C
Olsen, Wm. E.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	18	34	H
Roger, Alfred Clement	Pvt. Co. E, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	14	21	F
Thomsen, Otto	do.	1232	18	15	F
Torborg, Nicholas	Pvt. Co. D, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	16	20	F
Woodford, Louis Oscar	Pvt. Co. M, 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	16	21	F
Ydstie, Hjalmar Len-	Pvt. Hq. Co., 54 Pion. Inf.	1232	5	34	D
nard.					
Cass, Harold Hill	Pvt. Co. M, 55 Pion. Inf.	1233	33	17	D
Dahl, Thos.	Pvt. Co. D, 55 Pion. Inf.	608	11	17	C
Mathews, Wm.	Pvt. Co. E, 503 Pion. Inf.	1233	15	25	C
Cox, Sam.	Pvt. Co. B, 515 Pion. Inf.	1232	5	4	B
Dusek, Frank	Pvt. Q. M. Corps.	608	15	27	D
Zalesky, Chas. G.	Sgt. 325 Bak. Co., Q. M. C.	608	14	28	A
Curry, Claude H.	Pvt. 25 Co. Cp. McArthur	608	9	29	D
	S. R. D.				
Maggs, Walter L.	Pvt. 14 Co. Cp. Gordon	608	21	29	D
	S. R. D.				
Prestegard, Jos.	Pvt. 27 Co. Cp. McArthur	608	36	25	C
	S. R. D.				
Smith, Harold J.	Pvt. 11 Co. S. A. R. D.	608	36	40	D
Steen, Philip A.	Pvt. 18 Cas. Co. Cp. Cody	108-E	2	5	D
	J. R. D.				
Stewart, Wm. E.	Pvt. 11 Co. Cp. McArthur	608	9	20	D
	S. R. D.				
Pehrson, Arthur B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 409 Tel. Bn.	34	7	3	B
West, Blanchard	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 412 Tel. Bn.	34	22	5	B
McCoy, Wm. T.	Cpl. Co. C, 13 Engrs.	1232	33	37	H
Austad, Cunder G.	Pvt. Co. D, 20 Engrs.	107-E	7	2	A
Berkey, Edwin R.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 20 Engrs.	107-E	17	3	A
Brown, Frank	Wag. Co. D, 4 Bn. 20 Engrs.	608	34	7	A
Buskrud, Hjalmar	Pvt. 1 cl., 49 Co., 20 Engrs.	1764	19	8	B
Cochrane, Frank W.	Pvt. Co. D, 21 Engrs.	1233	31	17	A
O'Leary, Thos. C.	Pvt. Co. C, 33 Engrs.	608	30	5	D
Nylen, Samuel J.	Pvt. 1 cl., Co. E, 34 Engrs.	608	12	23	B
Erickson, Jos. G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 41 Engrs.	34	2	1	A
Golly, Freely E.	Pvt. Co. G, 54 Engrs.	34	1	8	A
Hainlin, Alfred C.	Sgt. Co. A, 57 Engrs.	636	8	29	B
Forbes, Guy R.	1 lt. Co. C, 508 Engrs.	1233	14	1	D
Fuller, Harry H.	Wag. 464 Engr. Pontoon Tn.	34	6	3	A
Thompson, Delbert A.	2 lt. L. R. & R. Div. Engrs.	1232	35	39	B
Brain, Geo. D.	Sgt. 7 Co. Off. Tn. Sch.	608	34	30	A
Hays, Earl E.	Pvt. Co. D, 11 U. S. M. O.	608	26	35	A
Goudy, Francis Boyd	Pvt. Co. E, 13 U. S. M. O.	608	18	20	C
Halverson, John	W. T. U. S. Navy	608	11	10	C
Peterson, Alfred H.	Sml. 1 cl. U. S. Navy	34	18	16	A
Shaffe, Wm. Dean	Fm. 2 cl. U. S. Navy	608	7	21	D
Spiering, Clemens E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 327 Bn.	1232	5	30	G
	T. O.				
Nygreen, Peter	Cpl. 34 Co. Tr. Cps.	608	27	12	C
Weekly, Frank	Pvt. 803 Co. Tr. Cps.	608	30	22	D

PROHIBITION

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Under the agreement with the gentleman from Connecticut, I am compelled to ask the gentleman on what subject he desires to speak?

Mr. CLANCY. I made a trip to the Detroit River recently, and I want to speak on the prohibition situation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, the press of the country has generally heralded that there is now an unusual drive of the prohibition forces on the Detroit River and contiguous waters. The Detroit Yachting Association has protested against the danger of innocent persons being killed or wounded by indiscriminate shooting on the river and adjoining lakes. Their officers point out that their yachts have been stopped and searched by prohibition agents and their children and wives frightened by the officers.

The swarming, snooping, sneaking agents have terrorized the thousands of people who use our waters; they have made boating and fishing a menace.

TOURIST BUSINESS BEING KILLED

Detroit has always made a great deal of money out of hundreds of thousands of tourists who came each spring, summer, and fall to beautiful Detroit, but now automobilists as well as boating and fishing enthusiasts are staying away for fear of their lives. It would be hard to estimate the damage to Detroit through the loss of this tourist business, but it runs into large figures. We have the Detroit Tourist and Convention Bureau, which spends a large amount of money to bring tourists to Detroit and I am expecting a vigorous complaint to the Treasury Department from this bureau.

We have had all sorts of scandals developing from the prohibition agents who are our unwelcome guests. They are guilty of murderous outrages, grafting, hijacking, and other crimes in large proportion to their total number. Twenty-three of them were arrested recently for grafting on a scale that ran into millions per year and some were sent to jail.

Ernest W. Camp, an honest and conscientious official who was until recently Chief of the United States Customs Bureau, made the startling admission to the Canadian Government at Ottawa that 90 per cent of the prohibition border patrol were rotten. This was the most terrible indictment ever made against an American group of officials in American history, and it came while the high American officials from Washington were begging the high Canadian officials in the Dominion capital to assist in stopping the flow of liquors from Canada to the United States. After the admission that the border patrol was so largely incompetent and guilty of worse than incompetency the Canadians refused to consider the American representations as binding on them. Shortly afterward Mr. Camp resigned his portfolio and went into private life.

The American Automobile Association, a thoroughly reputable body including within its membership and speaking for some 23,000,000 owners of motor cars in the United States, has protested against the reckless searching of automobiles.

DEFEATED IN FIRST BATTLE

The first battle of the Detroit River, beginning about a couple of years ago, resulted in a miserable failure. The net result of that prohibition campaign was the killing of a letter carrier named Neidermeier, 65 years of age, who was entirely innocent of carrying any liquor. He was shot in the back as he sat in his duck skiff and died in terrible agony in a few days.

For that offense one Jack Benway, a prohibition agent, was sent to the penitentiary, after he had appealed his case to all of the superior courts, including the United States Supreme Court. A little girl, Mildred Lee, 11 years old, had her head torn off her body in the Detroit River by a speeding prohibition boat and her father, James Lee, was also killed.

The children of the Fisher boys—and the Fisher boys in the automobile world are second only to Henry Ford, and incidentally I might say the Fishers contributed \$125,000 to Herbert Hoover's campaign—were fired on by prohibition agents when riding in their speedboat on the river.

JACQUES REVEALS BAD CONDITIONS

A former prohibition agent named Louis Jacques has come to Washington from Detroit to-day. He was a superior officer of Jonah Cox, who shot the boy bootlegger in Detroit a few days

ago. Jacques resigned over Cox's promiscuous shooting and has come here to protest against conditions in the Detroit prohibition squad. He said that within three weeks this agent Cox who killed Eugsta had fired in two affairs recklessly.

On one occasion about June 1, Cox shot at a young lad named Mitchell who was riding in a boat. His riot gun jammed, and he said later, "Gee, if that gun had not jammed I would have blown that fellow's head off. I had to use my .45." The watchman at the Detroit-Toledo and Ironton Bridge complained, I am informed, of the promiscuous shooting at that time.

On June 10, at Zug Island, this agent fired at a boat. He did not see any liquor in the boat, which was speeding. A superior officer, this man Jacques, said to him, "Stop that shooting, you may hit some innocent person."

They were in the vicinity of a bridge, and automobiles loaded with people were passing over the bridge. Cox replied, "I would not stop shooting if I were in charge," and he then asked Jacques his name. Cox had made various reports and complaints to his superior officers on other prohibition agents in the service.

Jacques had filed a report to his superior officers before Cox killed this boy, to the effect that Cox was reckless and indiscriminate in the use of firearms.

WHITEWASHING BENWAY

With regard to whitewashing reckless prohibition agents, the most notorious case that we had was that of the old letter carrier Neidermeier who was hunting ducks. He had been for many years in the Postal Service, and was entirely innocent of wrong doing, having no liquor. He was shot at about 20 or 30 feet in the back through the kidneys with a bullet from a high-powered rifle.

A man named Pratt was the partner of this man Benway; and I was told that Pratt said when questioned by his superiors that "Benway was too quick with his gun," but evidently that did not suit the superior officers, because when the case came to trial both Pratt and Benway went on the stand and testified that each fired and that neither knew who had killed the man. However, the jury was discriminating enough to let Pratt go and convict Benway. The Government defended Benway and sent a first-class Department of Justice attorney from Washington to aid the local officials. The Anti-Saloon League gave Benway all possible assistance. The conviction of Benway broke the strong-arm campaign in Detroit waters.

OFFICIALS HAVE TOUGH JOB

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Treasury Department officials were reluctant to stage this second sensational drive in Detroit, but the pressure has been so great on them that they had to organize it.

I have talked with Governor Lowman, in charge, and he convinced me that he is a good official and does not desire to resort to strong-arm tactics. I do not want to condemn Doctor Doran. I think he is a pretty fair man, but he said to his men in Detroit who are waging this campaign that he is going to cut their heads off if they do not get results. Colonel Hanlon, who led the drive three years ago, told his men to be rough and to shoot.

But the leaders of the present drive use indirect methods. They say, "Don't let anything get by," and hint that shooting first and investigating later is what is wanted.

PUTTING PRESSURE ON FORCE

Some of these border-patrol men are in the Customs Service and have been for years; they are not fools; and they know that Doctor Doran can not cut their heads off, because they are under civil service. They resent very bitterly the pressure from Doctor Doran to be "rough." Jacques refers particularly to the tapping of telephone wires. I am informed Government agents tapping the telephone wires of the collector of Customs in Detroit. Jacques charges that they are tapping the wires of prohibition agents in the service. I believe this is not only an un-American practice but an illegal one. I believe the Supreme Court has said the aggrieved citizen can sue the telephone company which allows it for damages.

Jacques says the inspectors are forced to spy on each other. He says that they are forbidden to associate with each other off duty; that they are constantly watched and accused of crookedness; and they are forbidden to even speak to anyone suspected of being a bootlegger.

Furthermore, he charges that they are repeatedly told that they "must not let a boat get by them" on penalty of being fired. All this, he says, keys up the men to a point where they will shoot on a minute's notice; and they are worried constantly and harassed so much that a neurotic would go completely "hay wire." Jacques points out that the strain is terrific and

that many of the men interpret their orders that they must do hair-trigger shooting to hold their jobs.

This campaign in the Detroit River is going to have a vital effect on prohibition, undoubtedly. We have there the greatest fleet of pleasure craft probably in the world. There are many canoes there and they are constantly in danger. These prohibition boats will speed at night without lights. I have been told one canoe was run down and there is danger of killing boys and girls in canoes.

CANADA OFFENDED

Now, just a word about our relations with Canada. The armed prohibition boats have often gone into Canadian waters and have thus broken our ancient treaty with Canada. The agents work up much feeling in Canada against the United States and injure the American cause all along the line. Canada is the best customer at present of the United States, and these agents aid the propaganda in Canada against buying American products.

It will be impossible for all time to build the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence canal to the Atlantic if these prohibition forces continue to antagonize Canada.

ALL CITIZENS SHOULD HELP

I am very glad to get the testimony of men like Louis Jacques, who did not get into the border patrol through political influence and who passed a legitimate civil-service examination. He is a native Detroiter and son of Sergt. Henry Jacques, retired, who was a highly respected officer of the Detroit Police Department for many years. His son was raised in the high traditions of his father's profession. The high-handed tactics of the border patrol were simply too much for him, and he rebelled at the indiscriminate shooting and the consequent menace to innocent persons using the Detroit River and contiguous waters as their rightful heritage. Much of the valuable information which I have used in past years relative to the prohibition force has come from men in that service who were disgusted with the system in which they were enslaved.

I certainly commend all public-spirited citizens, in and out of the prohibition squads, all public officials, and all newspapers who are aiding this crusade to stop the reign of terror on the Detroit River. I condemn most emphatically all gunmen and hijackers that are the spawn of the eighteenth amendment. Police officers in Detroit have declared to me that every gunman in Detroit got his start from the eighteenth amendment, generally first running liquor and then being hardened to the indiscriminate use of firearms.

I am not familiar with the official record of Mr. Jacques, but I am informed that he was a conscientious agent, that he never trifled with rum runners or liquor agents, that he was regarded as a trustworthy officer and was put on the hot spots—that is, the strategic points of entry for liquor, such as Ecorse, Wyandotte, Zug Island, oil docks, and so forth.

He is now doing a service to good men in the border patrol who do not want to be forced into indiscriminate shooting and unlawful acts by overzealous superiors. I know other men like him in high positions of the Treasury Department and prohibition units who are absolutely fed up with strong-armed tactics.

AMERICAN CEMETERIES, CHAPELS, AND MEMORIALS—WASHINGTON IN THE WORLD WAR

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I speak on a subject that is very close to the hearts of the mothers and widows of our hero dead who sleep in the American military cemeteries in Europe. What I have to say is of the deepest concern to those patriotic women, who gave so much for their country, and we, as Members of Congress, owe it to them to give them the information which I wish to present this afternoon.

Now, as you know, we recently passed a law which will enable the mothers and unmarried widows of our hero dead who have not previously visited the graves of their sons and husbands in Europe to do so at the expense of the United States Government. Under this law these visits will be made at such times between May 1, 1930, and October 31, 1933, as may be designated by the Secretary of War. Wide publicity is being given to this law, both through the daily press and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and many of these relatives are now beginning to plan in what year they wish to go.

What I wish to say now is for the benefit of these relatives, in order that they may plan their visits for such times as will bring to them the greatest consolation and satisfaction possible.

In planning the years of their visits many of these women do not know, perhaps, that our Government, in addition to the

work of beautification already carried out at these cemeteries, is now erecting in each of them a memorial chapel to be dedicated to those who gave their lives during the World War.

GRATEFUL NATION ERECTS IMPOSING MEMORIALS

I may say that these memorials, which are being erected by the American Battle Monuments Commission, of which Gen. John J. Pershing is chairman, were designed by some of the most prominent architects in the United States and have been approved by our National Commission of Fine Arts. These chapels will be monumental in nature, beautiful, restful, and imposing. They will be sanctuaries where these relatives may go for shelter, meditation, and prayer. They will be national memorials, befitting the purpose for which a grateful Nation erects them—such memorials as will be a source of consolation to the bereaved parents and widows. On the walls of the chapels will be inscriptions to the men who gave their lives. In addition, they will bear individual inscriptions giving the name, rank, organization, date of death, and State or Territory of the men who still sleep in unknown graves.

If the relatives of these hero dead knew that such memorials were being erected to their loved ones and knew when they would be completed, I feel sure that many of them would wish to make their plans so as to visit the cemeteries after the chapels are completed, when they can see for themselves the finished tribute of our Nation to their heroic sons and husbands.

I feel most strongly, therefore, that we, as Members of Congress, owe it to these relatives, whenever we give out publicity of any kind concerning these pilgrimages to Europe, to include information about these chapels and to give the probable date of the completion of each in order that these relatives may know in what year a particular chapel will be completed, and may plan their visits accordingly in case they so desire. Otherwise, many of these mothers and widows may be formulating their plans without knowing that these chapels are being built, and may be crystallizing their hopes on visiting the cemeteries earlier than they would wish to go if they knew such chapels were being erected.

CHAPELS NOT COMPLETED

I wish, therefore, to give here the probable dates of completion of the various chapels and to urge that wide publicity be given to this subject in order that every mother and widow will feel that we have fulfilled our duty to her in this respect by giving to her this information which she may wish to have when making her plans.

In the interest of these mothers and widows I have secured this information from the Battle Monuments Commission in Paris:

It is expected that the chapel in the Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, near Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, France, will be completed by May 30, 1932; that in the St. Mihiel American Cemetery, near Thiaucourt, France, by May 30, 1932; that in the Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, near Fere-en-Tardenois, France, by May 30, 1931; that in the Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, near Belleau, France, by the spring or summer of 1931; that in the Somme American Cemetery, near Bony, France, by May 30, 1931; that in the Flanders Field American Cemetery, near Waereghem, Belgium, by May 30, 1930; that in the Suresnes American Cemetery, near Paris, France, by May 30, 1931; and that in the Brookwood American Cemetery, near Brookwood, England, by May 30, 1930. Each of these chapels is now in process of construction.

I have introduced an amendment to the gold star mothers law extending the time of their visits to October, 1934, in order to give these mothers and widows an opportunity to see all cemeteries, chapels, and monuments when fully completed. Thus will they carry to their homes in America and cherish through life the unsurpassed beauty and simple grandeur of these temples of the dead.

Mr. KORELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. For a brief statement.

Mr. KORELL. I know the great interest that the gentleman from Washington has in the subject about which he is speaking. The House and the Nation are in his debt for the great amount of time that he has given to the task of seeing that the cemeteries in which the Nation's heroes, who made the supreme sacrifice during the World War, are buried are made as attractive and as expressive of the country's gratitude and reverence as it is possible for them to be made. His untiring devotion to this work is greatly appreciated by all the living comrades of those who nobly gave their lives as a part of the price of victory in the late struggle for freedom, justice, and democracy. I also know of his great personal interest in the legislation passed by the last Congress to enable the mothers and widows

of the deceased soldiers, sailors, and marines of the American forces now interred in the cemeteries of Europe to make a pilgrimage to the graves of their loved ones. I am wondering, however, if the gentleman's attention has been called to the fact that we had an expeditionary force in Siberia and that a considerable number of American soldiers are also buried there. Public Law No. 952, passed by the Seventieth Congress, which authorizes the Secretary of War to arrange for the pilgrimages to the graves of loved ones does not include pilgrimages to the graves of those deceased veterans who are buried in Siberia or in places in France, Belgium, or England other than the American cemeteries. I would like to inquire of the gentleman if anything has been done by his committee to correct this apparent oversight?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I am not a member of the committee that framed the legislation, but of the committee that provides the appropriations for carrying all of these laws into effect.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes; I gladly yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. SIMMONS. I introduced a bill early in the session to take care of the mothers not included in the bill referred to. That will make it possible for all mothers of service men to share in the benefits of the law. The law will then include all mothers of soldiers who died at sea or who were buried overseas.

CEMETERIES OF UNSURPASSED BEAUTY

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. For the benefit of the mothers and fathers, widows, and other relatives of our heroes who sleep in American cemeteries in Europe, I should like to give some additional information concerning these cemeteries and to tell something of what our Government is doing to beautify and hallow the ground where our brave boys sleep, and to keep forever alive the memory of their heroic service.

Soon after the war our Government established 8 national cemeteries in Europe—1 in England, not far from London; 1 in Belgium; and 6 in France. I venture to say that the world does not contain cemeteries more beautiful, more restful, more thoughtfully cared for than these. Flowers, trees, and shrubbery, laid out by the skillful and sympathetic hands of trained landscape gardeners and nurtured with tender care, lend a quiet beauty to these final resting places of our hero dead. The American flag, symbol of the glorious traditions which inspired these men in life to offer themselves in their country's cause, now floats in silent tribute over their graves. At each cemetery is an American caretaker, a veteran of the war, one who knows through what these men went, whose heart is in his work. In addition to his other duties, he extends a welcome to those who come to the cemetery seeking information, and aids them in locating individual graves or obtaining other desired information.

The wooden grave markers originally erected in these cemeteries have now been replaced by white marble headstones; a cross for those of Christian faith, a shield of David for those of Jewish faith. On these headstones are engraved the name, rank, organization, and date of death of the hero, as well as the State from which he came. These headstones are more than 3 feet high and stand as individual and imperishable monuments to those who gave their lives. Here and there is the grave of one who remains unknown, his headstone bearing the inscription:

Here rests in honored glory
An American soldier
Known but to God

These cemeteries are under the jurisdiction of the Quartermaster General of the Army, who has developed them, with the advice and cooperation of our National Commission of Fine Arts, into their present beautiful condition. An office of the Quartermaster General, known as the American Graves Registration Service, is in direct charge of these cemeteries and gives to them its constant care and supervision. For those who plan to visit Europe, I may say that the headquarters of this service are located in Paris, at 20 rue Molitor; and any information concerning the cemeteries or graves can be obtained either from them or from the Quartermaster General, Washington, D. C.

The American Battle Monuments Commission, of whose plans I shall speak in more detail a little later on, is now erecting in each of these cemeteries a memorial chapel, to be dedicated to those who gave their lives during the war. These chapels, which were designed after most careful study by some of the most prominent architects in the United States and approved by our National Commission of Fine Arts, will be beautiful, imposing, entirely harmonious with their surroundings, such edifices as befit the purpose for which a grateful Nation erects them.

MEUSE-ARGONNE CEMETERY LARGEST

The locations of the various cemeteries, together with other information of general interest concerning them, is as follows:

The largest of our overseas cemeteries is known as the Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery. It contains 14,134 graves and is located near the town of Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, France. The soldiers who rest here came from almost every division in the American Expeditionary Forces, most of them having given their lives in the Meuse-Argonne operation, one of the decisive battles of the war. Bodies were brought here from the area immediately west of the Argonne Forest, from the general vicinity of the Vosges Mountains, from occupied Germany, and from Archangel, Russia.

The cemetery is about 23 miles northwest of Verdun, which can be easily reached by train from Paris. Good hotel accommodations are available there and automobiles for a visit to the cemetery can be readily obtained. A hostess house which is maintained at the cemetery can provide rooms and meals for a limited number of visitors during the summer months.

The chapel now being erected here is an adaptation of the Romanesque style of architecture, and consists not only of the chapel proper—which forms the central part of the edifice—but also of two flanking arcades; the entire building being over 240 feet in length. This memorial will rise from a beautiful terraced site and stand at the end of a long, wide avenue that runs through the cemetery.

It is probable that the construction of this memorial chapel, which has already begun, will be completed by May 30, 1932.

ST. MIHIEL CEMETERY

The St. Mihiel American Cemetery, located near the town of Thiaucourt, France, is in the area of the St. Mihiel operation of the American Army. Here lie 4,143 soldiers, the majority of whom were members of the American divisions attacking in the great offensive action of our First Army, which resulted in the reduction of the St. Mihiel salient. Others buried here were among those who died while serving in sectors in the vicinity, or who were removed to this region in 1922 from training areas to the southwest.

The cemetery is almost equidistant by road, about 20 miles, from Nancy, Verdun, and Metz. There is good train service to each place, and at each of them fairly good hotel accommodations are available and automobiles may be hired. In the near future a main railroad line will pass through Thiaucourt. No suitable hotel accommodations are now available there.

CHAPEL GREEK DORIC STYLE

The memorial chapel now being erected in this cemetery is of modified Greek Doric style, and suggests something of the feeling of American colonial architecture. The central portion of the memorial will consist of what is known among architects as a peristyle, circular in form and open to the sky, surrounded by 16 columns. This peristyle, which is about 48 feet in diameter, will be flanked on one side by the chapel proper, and on the other side by an architectural feature of corresponding external design.

This memorial chapel, on which construction work has recently started, will probably be completed by May 30, 1932.

FIVE THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO SLEEP IN OISE-AISNE CEMETERY

The Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, located near Fere-en-Tardenois, France, contains 5,962 graves. The majority of the battle dead who sleep here are from the divisions that fought in the vicinity of the Ourcq River and in the territory from there to the north as far as the Oise River. In 1922, American soldiers then buried in France in the general area west of the line Tours-Romorantin-Paris-Le Havre were removed to this cemetery.

It is about 18 miles by road from Chateau-Thierry or from Soissons to the cemetery, and slightly more from Reims. Good train service is available to each of these places, where hotel accommodations can be obtained and automobiles hired.

The memorial chapel now being erected in this cemetery is a modern adaptation of the French Romanesque style of architecture. The central portion of the memorial will be a semi-circular arcade, at one end of which will be the chapel proper and at the other end an architectural feature of similar external appearance; the entire edifice being over 100 feet wide.

It is probable that the work of erecting this memorial chapel will be completed by May 30, 1931.

AISNE-MARNE NEAR BELLEAU WOOD

The Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, containing 2,212 graves, lies near Belleau, France, at the foot of the hill upon which stands Belleau Wood. The majority of those who are buried here are from units that fought in the immediate vicinity and along the Marne River. A number of bodies were concentrated

in this place in 1922 from the general vicinity of Lyon and Clermont in central France.

The cemetery is 6 miles northwest of Chateau-Thierry, which is on the main railroad running east from Paris. Fair hotel accommodations are available at Chateau-Thierry and automobiles may be hired there.

ROMANESQUE CHAPEL

The memorial chapel now being erected in this cemetery is of the transitional French Romanesque style of architecture. In external appearance it will give the impression of a massive tower. With its retaining walls and terrace the entire edifice will be some 110 feet in height and will stand on the slope of the hill that rises toward Belleau Wood.

It is hoped that this chapel will be completed during the spring or summer of 1931. It is not possible at this time, however, to say definitely when the work will be completed and for this reason it is believed that those who plan to visit this cemetery and wish to see the chapel and other architectural improvements completed should plan to make their visits in 1932 instead of in 1931.

SOMME AMERICAN CEMETERY AND MASSIVE SHAFT

The Somme American Cemetery, located near the town of Bony, France, is the resting place of 1,830 soldiers. Members of the Twenty-seventh and Thirtieth Divisions who fell in the vicinity, as well as those of the First Division who gave their lives in the operations near Cantigny, and of the Thirty-third and Eightieth Divisions who fell in the operations while serving with the British, are buried here. In addition, all other American soldiers who died on or behind the British front in France and who were not removed to the United States in 1922 now sleep here.

The site is about 11 miles northeast of St. Quentin, which can be reached by train from Paris. Hotel accommodations are available and motor transportation may be hired there.

The chapel now being erected in this cemetery is an adaptation of the Romanesque style of chapel architecture. In general form it will be like a massive shaft, with a low, somewhat pyramidal covering, being nearly 50 feet in height and 26 feet in length and in breadth.

This chapel will probably be completed by May 30, 1931.

NINETY-FIRST DIVISION MEN SLEEP IN FLANDERS FIELD

The Flanders Field American Cemetery is located near Waereghem, Belgium, about halfway between Brussels and Ypres, and contains 367 graves. It is on ground captured by the Ninety-first Division. The soldiers buried here are mainly those of the Thirty-seventh and Ninety-first Divisions who died in this part of Flanders, and of the Twenty-seventh and Thirtieth Divisions, who fell near Ypres.

The cemetery is about 19 miles from Ghent, 27 miles from Lille, and 46 miles from Brussels. These places are easily reached by railroad, and have good hotel accommodations. Automobiles may be hired at them.

As the graves in this cemetery are arranged on the four sides of a square, leaving an open space in the center, the chapel now being erected here will be placed in the center of the cemetery. An added beauty will be given to its setting by encircling it with a shallow sunken garden. The chapel, which will be octagonal in shape, will be about 38 feet high and 20 feet in diameter.

It is hoped that this chapel will be completed by May 30, 1930.

SURESNES NEAR WALLS OF PARIS

The Suresnes American Cemetery lies on the slope of Mont Valerien, about 3 miles west of the walls of Paris. It overlooks the capital of France, and contains 1,507 graves.

The town of Suresnes can easily be reached from Paris by train, street car, or automobile. The cemetery is about 200 yards from the railroad station.

The chapel now being erected in this cemetery will give, in its general exterior appearance, the feeling of American colonial architecture. Entrance to the building will be by the way of a colonnaded porch, and this porch will be approached from two sides by short flights of stairs. The chapel, including the approach stairs, will be about 42 feet high and about the same in length and breadth.

It is hoped this chapel will be completed by May 30, 1931.

BROOKWOOD HAS BEAUTIFUL ENGLISH SETTING

The Brookwood American Cemetery, located about 28 miles southwest of London, contains 437 graves. It forms part of a very large and beautiful British cemetery, which was established many years ago. The American section adjoins one used for British war burials.

The American bodies buried in this cemetery were concentrated after the armistice from various places throughout England, Scotland, and Ireland, and consist of those members of

the American Expeditionary Forces who lost their lives in Great Britain or its surrounding waters during the war.

It is a pleasant drive by automobile from London to Brookwood through an interesting part of England, and a trip to the cemetery in this way can be comfortably made in half a day. Brookwood can also be reached from London on the London & South Western Railway. The American cemetery is about 400 yards southwest of the railroad station.

The chapel in this cemetery is an adaptation of the Greek Doric order of architecture. The edifice is about 34 feet square, with small projecting wings on each side and a portico in front, the columns of the portico being 15 feet high and 2¼ feet in diameter at the base. The chapel is surrounded by a semi-circular path and hedge.

This chapel will be completed during the present year.

MEMORIALS IN EUROPE

A few years ago Congress created a commission, known as the American Battle Monuments Commission, for the purpose of erecting memorials in Europe to commemorate the service of the American forces there during the World War. One of my duties, as well as one of my pleasures, as a member of the Appropriations Committee of the House has been to pass upon the plans formulated by that commission and to give my support in providing funds for the work.

I recently spent an hour with General Pershing, the chairman of the commission, in going over these plans; and as they are of great interest to all who served during the World War, as well as to their relatives and friends, I shall summarize briefly what they are.

As stated before, this commission is erecting in each of the cemeteries a beautiful memorial chapel. It also plans to construct masonry walls at the cemeteries where these are needed and to add other desirable architectural features in the cemeteries. These architectural improvements, which are a part of the commission's work of commemoration, are in addition to the work of beautification which has already been carried out by the Quartermaster General of the Army.

The chapels, which will be nondenominational in character, will be dedicated to those who gave their lives during the war and will stand not only as enduring monuments to their achievements and sacrifices but will furnish a sheltered place where relatives and other visitors may go for meditation and prayer. In these chapels will be inscribed the names of men who lost their lives but whose bodies have not been identified. This inscription will include the name, rank, organization, and date of death of the hero, as well as the name of the State from which he came.

In addition to these memorial chapels in the cemeteries, the commission plans to erect 16 monuments at places outside of the cemeteries.

The list of architects selected by the commission to design these monuments, as well as the chapels, was prepared with the assistance of the National Commission of Fine Arts. The list was compiled with great care, and comprises a number of the most prominent architects or firms in the United States, as well as some younger architects. The designs for most of the monuments have already been prepared and approved by the American Battle Monuments Commission and the National Commission of Fine Arts, and the construction of a number of them has already begun. These memorials will, like the chapels, be of great beauty, dignity, and impressiveness—monuments worthy of the ideals of our Nation.

MASSIVE COLUMN COMMEMORATES OUR GREATEST BATTLE

The most important of the memorials in the commission's project is the one to commemorate the Meuse-Argonne operation, the greatest battle in American history. This monument, one of the main features of which is a massive column 160 feet in height, is to be placed in the old town of Montfaucon, France. Montfaucon was located on one of the dominating hills of the region and was captured by the American Army during its offensive which started on September 26, 1918. The town was completely destroyed, and the ruins are now being preserved by the French Government as a relic of the war.

BEAUTIFUL COLONNADE AT ST. MIHIEL

The next most important monument in the commission's project is one to commemorate the operation of the American First Army, which resulted in the reduction of the St. Mihiel salient. This monument will also commemorate the operation of the American Second Army in this region during November, 1918. This memorial, which will be over 70 feet high and include a circular colonnade 40 feet in diameter, is to be located on Montsec, an isolated hill about 150 yards high. This hill was within the German lines during most of the war, and is a familiar landmark to all who served in the St. Mihiel region. The view from the top of the hill is very impressive. The commission's plans

include the construction of a road up the hill and the placing of a memorial on its crest.

CHATEAU-THIERRY ON HILL 204

Of almost equal importance to the St. Mihiel memorial is one to be erected near Chateau-Thierry, France, to commemorate all activities of American troops in the Aisne-Marne region of France. The site is on Hill 204, west of Chateau-Thierry and just above the small village of Courteau. This monument proper will be 150 feet in length, and counting its retaining walls will be over 400 feet in length. From it an extensive and beautiful view can be obtained of Chateau-Thierry and the Marne Valley. To make the monument readily accessible a branch road about one-half mile long is being built, connecting it with the main highway between Paris and Chateau-Thierry.

OTHER BATTLE MEMORIALS

In addition to these three large memorials on the battle fields a number of others will be erected which will be more modest in character, conforming to the lesser relative importance of the operations which they are to commemorate.

One of these, on Blanc Mont Ridge, in the Champagne region of France, will recall the service of the Second, Thirty-sixth, Forty-second, and Ninety-third Divisions in that region while serving with the French.

Near Bony a monument will preserve the memory of the services of the American troops that fought in France with the British Army. The site for this memorial is exactly over the canal tunnel north of St. Quentin, between Bony and Bellcourt, near the main road which runs north and south in that region.

A monument at Cantigny will commemorate the capture of that town by the First Division in the first independent divisional operation of Americans during the World War.

In the public square at Audenarde, Belgium, a monument will be erected to the Thirty-seventh and Ninety-first Divisions for their services in Belgium.

On the road between Ypres and Mount Kemmel will be another memorial to recall the services of the Twenty-seventh and Thirtieth Divisions with the British in that vicinity.

The Services of Supply, numbering more than half a million men, contributed very materially to the final victory, and a memorial fountain to commemorate their splendid work will be erected at Tours, France, in which city the headquarters of the Services of Supply were located during the war.

MONUMENTS AT ROME AND BREST

Another of the monuments is to be placed in Rome, Italy, to commemorate jointly the services of the American Army and Navy in Italy and surrounding waters during the World War and the cooperation between Italy and the United States.

A memorial at Brest, France, will commemorate the services of the Navy in convoying troops and supplies to Europe. The site selected is a splendid one on the ancient fortifications overlooking the harbor, which is so familiar to the many Americans who received their first and last impression of France at this port.

Another large memorial to commemorate the services of the American Navy will be erected in England.

A smaller memorial to commemorate the services of the American Navy will be erected at Gibraltar.

Another small naval memorial will be erected at Ponta Delgada in the Azores.

Small bronze tablets will be placed on the buildings which were used, respectively, as the general headquarters of the American Expeditionary Forces at Chaumont and the headquarters of the American First Army at Souilly.

Definite dates for the completion of these monuments can not be stated at this time, but it is expected that practically all of them will have been completed by the spring of 1933 and some of them by the spring of 1931.

LATER VISITS MORE SATISFACTORY

As Americans traveling in Europe will derive greater satisfaction and pleasure from their visits if they can see the memorial chapels and monuments in their completed state—the visible symbols in foreign lands of the gratitude of our Nation for the heroic achievements and sacrifices of its sons—it is believed that those who plan to take only one trip to Europe would find themselves more than repaid if they postpone their visits until 1933 or at least until 1931 or 1932.

STATE OF WASHINGTON IN THE WORLD WAR

My State has always been highly patriotic and had a prominent part in the World War. From such information as I possess I relate this very incomplete story, that it may be recorded for future reference.

In orders dated July 18, 1917, the Secretary of War designated the sites for the National Army and National Guard cantonments, the Army divisions that would occupy these canton-

ments, and the geographical sources from which the troops composing the divisions would be drawn. National Army men from the State of Washington were to be sent to Camp Lewis, American Lake, Wash., where the Ninety-first Division was formed. The National Guard of the State of Washington was to be sent to Camp Fremont, Palo Alto, Calif., where the Forty-first Division was to be organized. However, on August 22, 1917, the place of mobilization of the Forty-first Division was changed from Camp Fremont to Camp Greene, Charlotte, N. C.

NATIONAL GUARD FIRST CALLED

The first military units from the State of Washington in the service after the declaration of war were National Guard organizations, the Second Infantry, Washington National Guard, having been called into the Federal service by the President of the United States in March, 1917, "to afford a more perfect protection against possible interference with postal, commercial, and military channels and instrumentalities of the United States in the State of Washington, Regular troops not being available for the faithful execution of the laws of the Union in this regard." Other units of the Washington National Guard called into the Federal service on July 25, 1917, were the First Squadron Cavalry, First Battalion Signal Corps, and the companies of Coast Artillery Corps. The First Battalion Field Artillery entered the Federal service August 5, 1917.

REORGANIZATION

The designations of Washington National Guard units were changed on reorganization as follows: The Second Regiment, Washington National Guard, became the One hundred and sixty-first Regiment, Infantry, September 19, 1917. The First Squadron, Cavalry, was broken up and the personnel used to form new units; machine-gun troop became Company B, One hundred and forty-seventh Machine Gun Battalion; Troop A became Company A, One hundred and sixteenth Train Headquarters and Military Police; Troop B was broken up, the personnel forming a part of headquarters detachment, Company A and Company B, One hundred and sixteenth Train Headquarters and Military Police; Troop C became headquarters troop, Forty-first Division; Troop D was broken up and the personnel formed part of headquarters detachment, Company A and Company B, One hundred and sixteenth Train Headquarters and Military Police; medical detachment was transferred to the medical detachment of the One hundred and sixteenth Train Headquarters and Military Police and medical detachment, One hundred and sixty-third Infantry. Batteries A, B, and C, First Battalion, Field Artillery, Washington National Guard, became Batteries D, E, and F, One hundred and forty-sixth Field Artillery, respectively. The First Battalion Signal Corps, Washington National Guard, was reorganized, headquarters and supply section, Companies A, B, and C, and medical detachment becoming headquarters and supply section, Companies A, B, and C, and medical detachment, One hundred and sixteenth Field Signal Battalion, respectively. Field Hospital No. 1, Washington National Guard, became Field Hospital No. 163. The companies of Coast Artillery, Washington National Guard, were reorganized, forming various companies of the coast defenses of Puget Sound. Many men, however, were transferred to other Coast Artillery organizations. Among the transfers to other Coast Artillery units, 734 enlisted men were transferred from the various units of the State Coast Artillery to the Sixty-third Regiment Coast Artillery Corps, 216 to the Sixty-fifth Regiment Coast Artillery Corps, and 71 to the Sixty-ninth Regiment, Coast Artillery Corps. The units of Washington Coast Artillery were redesignated on reorganization as follows:

Washington Coast Artillery, National Guard designation	Designation on reorganization
Noncommissioned staff.....	Noncommissioned staff, Fort Worden, Wash.
First Band.....	Thirtieth Band, Coast Artillery Corps.
First Company.....	Seventeenth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Second Company.....	Eighteenth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Third Company.....	Nineteenth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Fourth Company.....	Twentieth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Fifth Company.....	Twenty-first Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Sixth Company.....	Twenty-second Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Seventh Company.....	Twenty-third Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Eighth Company.....	Twenty-fourth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Ninth Company.....	Twenty-fifth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Tenth Company.....	Twenty-sixth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Eleventh Company.....	Twenty-seventh Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.
Twelfth Company.....	Twenty-eighth Company, Coast Defenses of Puget Sound.

NINETY-FIRST DIVISION

General orders of the War Department provided that men procured from Washington under the selective service law should be assigned to the Ninety-first Division. Under the first call the gross quota for the State of Washington was 12,768 men. Credit, however, was given for men in the service under voluntary enlistment in the National Guard or Regular Army, and of these there were 5,472 from the State, leaving a net quota under the first call of 7,296. The first contingent under this call was sent to Camp Lewis September 5-10, 1917, and by November 2, 1917, the entire first quota had been furnished. Later contingents were sent to Camp Lewis until the total number of inducted men from Washington procured under the selective service law exceeded 30,000.

On arrival at Camp Lewis, drafted men from Washington were assigned to various organizations, many of them to units of the Ninety-first Division, which served overseas, arriving in France in July, 1918. The Ninety-first Division was in combat service from September 12 to November 11, 1918.

BATTLE PARTICIPATION

Units which were composed in part of men from the State of Washington are entitled to credit for battle participation as follows:

One hundred and forty-sixth Field Artillery: Chateau Thierry sector (Champagne), July 9-14, 1918; Champagne-Marne defensive, July 15-18, 1918; Aisne-Marne offensive, July 18-August 6, 1918; Vesle sector (Champagne), August 7-12, 1918; St. Mihiel offensive, September 12-16, 1918; Meuse-Argonne offensive, September 26-November 11, 1918.

Field Hospital No. 163: Defensive sector (Lorraine), June 13-August 2, 1918; Aisne-Marne offensive, August 4-6, 1918; defensive sector (Champagne), August 7-17, 1918; Oise-Aisne offensive, August 18-20, 1918; St. Mihiel offensive, September 12-16, 1918; Meuse-Argonne offensive, September 26-November 11, 1918.

Ambulance Company No. 163: Aisne-Marne offensive, July 20-August 6, 1918; defensive sector (Champagne), August 7-17, 1918; Oise-Aisne offensive, August 18-20, 1918; St. Mihiel offensive, September 12-16, 1918; Meuse-Argonne offensive, September 26-November 11, 1918.

GENERAL OFFICERS

General officers who served in the Military Establishment during the World War included Brig. Gen. Benjamin Alvord, born in Washington; Brig. Gen. Edwin B. Babbitt, Brig. Gen. John L. Hayden, and Maj. Gen. Henry C. Hodges, jr., graduates of the United States Military Academy, appointed from Washington, and Brig. Gen. Laurin L. Lawson, former member of Washington National Guard, commissioned an officer in the United States Army from Washington.

COMMANDING OFFICERS, NATIONAL GUARD

The following were commanding officers of National Guard units of the State when called into Federal service: Second Infantry, Washington National Guard, Col. William M. Inglis; First Separate Squadron Cavalry, Washington National Guard, Maj. Hart W. Palmer; First Battalion Field Artillery, Washington National Guard, Maj. Paul H. Weyrauch (discharged with rank of colonel and is now brigadier general in the Reserve Corps); First Battalion Signal Corps, Washington National Guard, Maj. Jesse A. Jackson.

CASUALTIES

The battle casualties among men, who on entry into the military service gave Washington State as their place of residence, were as follows: Battle deaths, 696; wounds, not mortal, 1,971; total casualties, 2,667. (Members of the Navy or Marine Corps not included.)

TOTAL IN SERVICE

The total number of individuals in the military service from the State of Washington was 51,510, consisting of 3,095 officers, 71 Army field clerks, 417 nurses, 16 cadets, and 47,911 enlisted men. (Members of the Navy or Marine Corps not included.)

THE NAVY

The State of Washington was represented by—

Number in the service:	
Male.....	11,703
Female (reserves).....	144
Nurses (female).....	40
Total.....	11,887
Casualties:	
Male.....	
Killed in action.....	9
Lost at sea.....	3
Accidents.....	17
Disease.....	77
Suicide.....	2
Total.....	108
Female: Nurses (disease).....	1

There were 205 officers of the United States Navy and 581 officers of the United States Naval Reserve force whose World War service was accredited to the State of Washington.

MARINE CORPS

Total number of officers and men from State of Washington in the Marine Corps during the World War..... 2,596
 Number of officers and men who lost their lives in action..... 61
 Number of officers and men who died of disease..... 18
 Number of officers and men who died of other causes..... 3
 Total number of deaths..... 82

CITATIONS

Time does not permit me to relate here and now the imposing record of promotions and citations earned by our boys in the Army, Navy, and Marine service. However, in this fragmentary record of honorable service rendered by State of Washington men and women, I want to call the roll and record this information touching our honored dead who sleep beyond the seas.

KEY TO PERMANENT AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

FRANCE

No. 1232—Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, Meuse.

No. 1764—Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34—Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine (near Paris).

No. 636—Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608—Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1233—St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

BELGIUM

No. 1252—Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium.

ENGLAND

No. 107—E—Brookwood American Cemetery, Brookwood (near London), England.

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FIRST DIVISION					
Anderson, Albert E.	Cpl. Co. D, 16 Inf.	608	10	36	A
Lawrence, Thaddeus S.	Cpl. Co. A, 16 Inf.	1232	10	28	A
Roberts, Walter E.	Cpl. Co. E, 16 Inf.	1232	29	44	A
Axelsson, Herman	Pvt. Co. K, 18 Inf.	608	4	33	D
Dale, Helge	Pvt. Co. G, 18 Inf.	636	10	18	C
Hansen, Wilder C.	Pvt. Co. F, 18 Inf.	1232	35	39	G
Hendricks, Henry J.	Pvt. Co. G, 18 Inf.	608	8	36	B
Horsley, Paul C.	Cpl. Co. G, 18 Inf.	1232	35	9	E
Hughes, Russel	Pvt. Co. H, 18 Inf.	608	25	36	B
Lindskog, Elmer F.	do.	1232	20	42	G
Overas, Johannes	Pvt. Co. D, 18 Inf.	1232	25	6	E
Stumpf, Rudolph M.	Pvt. Co. F, 18 Inf.	608	4	36	B
Chambers, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. C, 26 Inf.	1232	9	46	C
Ciranny, Louis	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D., 26 Inf.	1232	19	3	C
Doan, Chas.	Pvt. Co. D, 26 Inf.	636	3	12	C
Doan, Eben	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 26 Inf.	608	12	13	D
Grinstein, Max	Pvt. Co. I, 26 Inf.	608	2	36	B
Hilderbrand, Clement W.	do.	608	27	17	D
Hreezuch, John	Pvt. Co. L, 26 Inf.	1764	53	7	B
Matejack, Edmund	Pvt. Co. B, 26 Inf.	1232	18	38	A
McWilliams, John	Pvt. Co. C, 26 Inf.	1232	39	19	C
Meystre, Emile F.	Pvt. Co. L, 26 Inf.	1764	45	6	B
Pfaff, Geo. W.	do.	608	23	36	B
Runyon, Dillard C.	Pvt. Co. I, 26 Inf.	608	18	36	A
Shonsey, Thos. B.	Pvt. Co. M, 26 Inf.	608	10	4	D
Snowden, Stanley	Pvt. Hq. Co., 26 Inf.	608	1	36	A
Wharton, Wm. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 26 Inf.	608	32	33	D
Beltman, Nick	Pvt. Co. L, 26 Inf.	636	14	32	A
Blum, John	do.	1232	38	7	G
Briet, Stanley F.	Pvt. Co. A, 28 Inf.	608	34	14	D
Busse, Jos. N.	Pvt. Co. L, 28 Inf.	608	4	6	D
Carlos, Jas. A.	Pvt. Co. A, 28 Inf.	608	37	14	D
Dille, Walter W.	do.	1232	1	20	H
Enright, Stephen A.	Cpl. Co. C, 28 Inf.	1232	17	25	H
Hamilton, Welker E.	Pvt. Co. A, 28 Inf.	1232	20	35	A
Mullin, Elisha	do.	608	20	29	C
Williamott, Dudley V.	Pvt. Co. M, 28 Inf.	1232	24	26	B
Gelden, Chas. S.	Pvt. Co. A, 1 M. G. Bn.	636	9	21	C
Leach, Alfred W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D, 6 F. A.	1232	22	28	C
Koon, Carter R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 1 Engrs.	608	29	15	D
SECOND DIVISION					
Anderson, Willard C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 9 Inf.	1232	20	40	E
Ashby, John E.	do.	608	9	36	D
Barrett, Russell	Pvt. Co. E, 9 Inf.	1232	19	39	G
Bigas, Ignatius	do.	1232	34	25	D
Bolli, John	Pvt. Co. K, 9 Inf.	1232	17	38	A
Carlson, Elmer H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 9 Inf.	608	21	8	C
Clements, Allen H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 9 Inf.	1764	6	13	A
Folmsbee, Paul W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 9 Inf.	1764	7	7	A
Hilliker, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 9 Inf.	1232	20	3	D
Jamieson, Jerome J.	Pvt. Co. H, 9 Inf.	1764	20	4	B
Martin, Orion F.	Pvt. Co. M, 9 Inf.	1232	40	9	F
Miller, Delmar A.	do.	1232	6	13	D
Miller, Ray H.	Pvt. Co. I, 9 Inf.	1232	5	15	E
Motespappa, Tony	Pvt. Co. M, 9 Inf.	608	11	4	D
Nelson, Arnold V.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 9 Inf.	1764	32	7	A
Nelson, Oscar	Cpl. Co. H, 9 Inf.	1232	13	12	E
Pappas, Peter	Pvt. Co. K, 9 Inf.	1232	18	21	H
Perry, Geo. T.	do.	608	10	37	D

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SECOND DIVISION—CON.					
Peterson, Andrew	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 9 Inf.	1232	36	18	D
Pietrowsky, Jos.	Pvt. Co. L, 9 Inf.	608	4	30	D
Prather, Wm. E.	Cpl. Co. L, 9 Inf.	1232	23	40	E
Roppert, Theodore	Pvt. Co. I, 9 Inf.	1232	15	16	A
Schmeling, Herman C.	Pvt. Co. K, 9 Inf.	608	24	22	B
Willard, Richard C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 9 Inf.	608	38	32	A
Abrams, Walter W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 23 Inf.	608	4	35	B
Armstrong, Wells	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1764	69	1	A
Beebe, Leon A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	25	38	H
Bennett, Raymond A.	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	34	31	14	B
Blythe, Roderick	do.	1764	70	1	A
Dringham, Ira W.	Pvt. Co. G, 23 Inf.	608	13	9	C
Crown, Jas.	do.	608	23	10	C
Bollins, Geo. L.	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	21	2	H
Balba, Frank	do.	1232	3	8	F
Dodge, Jess Ellis	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 23 Inf.	608	15	21	B
Gudopp, Walter R.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 23 Inf.	608	18	32	D
Hansen, Henry W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	30	22	E
Hart, Dan N.	Cpl. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	14	45	B
Heskett, Paul R.	Pvt. Co. B, 23 Inf.	1232	24	3	D
Hoke, Everett	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 23 Inf.	1764	37	8	A
Neutens, John B.	Pvt. Co. M, 23 Inf.	1232	24	29	A
Nottingham, Seymour	Pvt. Co. K, 23 Inf.	1764	53	3	A
Reynolds, Ward A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 23 Inf.	1232	20	10	H
Ryan, Logan L.	Cpl. Co. C, 23 Inf.	1232	15	28	E
Torkleip, John A.	Pvt. Co. K, 23 Inf.	1764	36	4	A
Allen, Jas. Nelson	Pvt. 20 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	65	5	A
Auten, Lawrence Leslie	Pvt. 55 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	19	43	B
Beach, Jos. Mansfield	Pvt. 45 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	43	5	B
Bull, Albert Noren	Pvt. 20 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	13	31	G
MacGregor, Lewis A.	Pvt. 47 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	66	3	A
Pond, Philip Marston	Cpl. 67 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	24	14	A
Stinson, Daniel Chase	Pvt. 17 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1764	76	6	B
Van Dyke, Thos. John	Pvt. 66 Co., 5 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	27	19	E
Bisbee, Earl Brunson	Sgt. 76 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	20	5	D
Lindblad, Edw. Jas.	Pvt. 79 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	1232	23	4	C
Mead, Archie Leroy	Pvt. 76 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	30	23	C
Miles, Ellis Merle	Sgt. 84 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	608	25	15	D
Short, Elmer Spencer	Pvt. 84 Co., 6 Regt., U. S. M. C.	34	34	11	B
Bulleri, Giuseppe J.	Pvt. Co. A, 4 M. G. Bn.	1764	3	1	A
Kencke, Earl A.	Cpl. Co. C, 5 M. G. Bn.	1232	7	8	F
Deishl, Edw. Jos.	Pvt. 23 Co., 6 M. G. Bn., U. S. M. C.	1232	39	14	F
Lannom, Altie	do.	1232	11	11	F
Newborg, Geo. Leofred	Pvt. 15 Co., 6 M. G. Bn., U. S. M. C.	1232	18	13	H
Royce, Eugene C.	Pvt. Bty. D, 15 F. A.	1232	17	28	H
Rueff, Ernest J.	Pvt. Co. D, 2 Amm. Tn.	1232	21	9	C
THIRD DIVISION					
Eller, Earl W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 38 Inf.	1232	37	19	H
Faulkner, Earl M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 7 M. G. Bn.	1764	73	6	A
Munro, Donald	Pvt. Co. A, 7 M. G. Bn.	1764	38	6	A
Scott, Bert T.	Cpl. Bty. A, 10 F. A.	1232	27	25	A
Herrera, Demetrio	Pvt. Co. B, 6 Engrs.	1232	19	38	G
Parenty, Alfred	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 6 Engrs.	608	20	19	A
Smith, Thos. S.	Pvt. M. D., 6 Engrs.	1232	6	9	F
Teiseth, Jacob B.	do.	1232	2	43	A
Bloyd, Harry B.	Sgt. Co. C, 5 F. S. Bn.	1764	8	6	A
Williams, Henry	Pvt. M. D., 5 F. S. Bn.	1232	5	2	D
Lang, Anton C.	Wag. M. D., 5 F. H. 26.	1232	33	13	D
FOURTH DIVISION					
Hodge, Wm. G.	2 Lt. Co. M., 39 Inf.	1232	16	2	B
Baltus, Walter	Pvt. Co. D, 39 Inf.	1232	10	30	D
Jurewicz, Jos.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 39 Inf.	608	8	18	B
Lyford, Arthur W.	do.	608	18	1	C
Marvin, Elbert	Pvt. Co. H, 39 Inf.	1232	29	9	B
Mason, Alf.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 39 Inf.	1232	6	32	H
Reano, Jos.	Pvt. Co. M, 39 Inf.	608	12	16	B
Lewis, Lee C.	Capt. Hq. Co., 47 Inf.	608	4	14	A
Allen, Thos.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co., 47 Inf.	1232	15	33	A
Kalkwarf, Geo. P.	Pvt. Co. L, 47 Inf.	608	16	8	B
Nelson, John A.	Cpl. Co. G, 47 Inf.	1232	29	31	C
Papavasil, Jim	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 47 Inf.	1764	29	12	B
Anderson, Eddie O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 58 Inf.	1764	55	3	B
Hauan, Bendik	Pvt. Co. C, 58 Inf.	608	25	6	C
Pietrogianco, Daniel	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 58 Inf.	608	23	1	C
Rongey, Herschel	Pvt. Co. G, 58 Inf.	608	37	4	B
Skonesvik, Jacob R.	Pvt. Co. I, 58 Inf.	608	25	22	B
Arnold, Burton B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 59 Inf.	1232	5	7	F
Chapin, Park S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 59 Inf.	1232	6	45	C
Edson, Al.	Sgt. Co. F, 59 Inf.	1232	11	5	H
Preslawie, Anton J.	Pvt. Co. C, 59 Inf.	1232	16	26	E
Remedes, Jas. B.	Pvt. Co. G, 59 Inf.	1764	80	2	A
Remmerden, John H.	Cpl. Co. C, 59 Inf.	1232	29	4	H
Morris, Abraham L.	Sgt. Co. E, 4 Engrs.	608	1	34	D
FIFTH DIVISION					
Nolan, Chas. M.	Sgt. Co. I, 11 Inf.	1232	33	3	E
Taylor, Henry A.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 60 Inf.	1232	33	38	C
Wilson, Richard M.	1 Lt. Co. C, 7 Engrs.	34	5	5	C
Leidl, Louis	2 Lt. Co. D, 7 Engrs.	1232	32	13	G

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Johnson, Henry R.	Pvt. Co. C, 101 Inf.	1232	19	35	F
McCown, Geo. R.	Pvt. Co. E, 101 Inf.	1232	37	27	F
Kressler, Lee L.	Pvt. Co. H, 102 Inf.	608	28	12	A
Metcalfe, Jack	do.	608	26	6	A
Cavelero, Charley M.	Pvt. Co. D, 103 Inf.	1233	3	15	D
Hemphill, Clarence J.	1 lt. Hq. Co. 101 F. A.	1232	11	40	C
Becker, Henry	Pvt. Bty. C, 103 F. A.	1232	13	29	G
TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION					
Bradburn, Thos. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 109 Inf.	1232	38	10	D
Chesser, Lewis E.	Pvt. Co. G, 102 Inf.	1232	1	26	F
Duckworth, Hally O.	Pvt. Co. D, 109 Inf.	1232	13	32	E
Johnstone, Frank	Pvt. Co. B, 109 Inf.	1232	33	22	C
Mabry, Frank T.	Pvt. Co. L, 109 Inf.	608	9	16	A
Martin, Fred	Pvt. Co. M, 109 Inf.	1232	3	25	D
Mason, Robt. P.	Pvt. Co. H, 109 Inf.	1233	14	19	B
Monson, Fredk. H.	Pvt. Co. L, 109 Inf.	1232	6	10	A
Morrow, Wm.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 Inf.	1232	32	38	A
Mullin, Thos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 109 Inf.	1232	8	16	C
Shea, Frank W.	Pvt. Co. D, 109 Inf.	1232	38	23	D
Shields, Arthur N.	Pvt. Co. H, 109 Inf.	1232	3	39	F
Simpson, Guy L.	do.	1232	29	8	C
Bardosas, Nicholas	Pvt. Co. H, 110 Inf.	1232	4	25	A
Beglen, Jas.	Pvt. Co. B, 110 Inf.	1232	21	5	C
Carlson, Per E. S.	Pvt. Co. K, 110 Inf.	1232	27	11	C
Chounos, Geo.	Pvt. Co. H, 110 Inf.	1232	13	18	E
Cross, Franklin S.	Pvt. Co. D, 110 Inf.	1232	19	28	B
Gust, Geo.	Pvt. Co. C, 110 Inf.	1232	35	32	C
Wells, Henry S.	Pvt. Co. I, 110 Inf.	1232	25	2	C
Winchell, Frank T.	Pvt. Co. G, 110 Inf.	1232	11	24	A
Angelini, Giovanni	Pvt. Co. L, 111 Inf.	1232	4	2	B
Beck, Harry G.	Cpl. Co. M, 111 Inf.	1232	8	40	B
Bassetti, Mariano	Pvt. Co. F, 112 Inf.	1232	22	1	B
Hansen, Einer T.	Pvt. Co. D, 112 Inf.	1232	37	35	G
Kehrer, John	Pvt. Co. K, 112 Inf.	1232	16	14	C
Matson, Henry	do.	1232	9	27	B
Nelson, Anton H.	do.	1232	26	44	C
Huschke, Bernhard H.	Wag. Co. E, 103 Engrs.	608	33	6	B
Nelson, Walter Arnold	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 103 Sup. Tn.	608	30	10	D
THIRTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Lofacono, Frank	Pvt. Co. L, 125 Inf.	1232	12	21	D
Nielsen, Niels C.	Pvt. Co. B, 125 Inf.	608	35	36	D
Tira, Florenzo	do.	608	16	8	A
Black, Chas. M.	Cpl. Co. L, 126 Inf.	608	16	1	D
Enoch, Paul S.	Pvt. Co. M, 126 Inf.	1764	28	3	B
Erickson, Olaf F.	Pvt. Co. A, 126 Inf.	1232	40	20	F
Freese, Frank W.	Pvt. Co. L, 126 Inf.	1232	11	2	D
Kelly, Dan	Pvt. Co. F, 126 Inf.	1232	19	13	H
Kristoferson, Alfred	Sgt. Co. A, 126 Inf.	1232	13	26	C
Mercer, Bruce A.	Pvt. Co. E, 126 Inf.	1232	26	37	D
Orr, Russell A.	Pvt. Co. G, 126 Inf.	608	28	6	D
Runyon, Jos. W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 126 Inf.	1232	32	15	E
Schmitz, Phillip	1 lt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	33	38	A
Blomberg, Henry S.	1 lt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	39	30	G
Mackay, Wm. R.	1 lt. Co. D, 127 Inf.	1232	25	43	H
Bruhn, Arent A.	Pvt. Co. F, 127 Inf.	1232	26	33	A
Cesato, Vitterio	Cpl. Co. A, 127 Inf.	1232	31	33	B
Deeringhoff, Ferdinand E.	do.	1232	2	28	G
Dresser, Frank A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 127 Inf.	1232	2	40	H
Halverson, John A.	Pvt. Co. F, 128 Inf.	1232	1	5	D
Harem, Andrew	Pvt. Co. A, 127 Inf.	1232	13	10	A
Hunsinger, Wm. A.	do.	1232	38	29	A
Keel, Edw. H.	do.	608	40	5	G
Mascadri, Angelo	Pvt. Co. L, 127 Inf.	1232	28	45	B
Moore, John	Pvt. Co. E, 127 Inf.	1232	34	10	B
Wolf, Edw. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 127 Inf.	34	34	29	A
Harrison, Frank	Pvt. Co. C, 128 Inf.	608	32	44	D
Sorensen, John	Pvt. Co. F, 128 Inf.	1232	30	36	D
Turley, Clarence L.	Cpl. Co. I, 128 Inf.	608	5	16	D
Warner, John E.	Pvt. Co. B, 119 M. G. Bn.	608			
THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION					
Doyle, Delta W.	Cpl. Co. F, 139 Inf.	1232	13	46	C
FORTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Baker, Harvey C.	Pvt. Co. F, 161 Inf.	1233	12	1	B
Brundage, Cleo E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 161 Inf.	1233	33	16	A
Cunningham, Edw. C.	Mun. Hq. Co. 161 Inf.	608	34	12	A
Oleman, Herbert	Pvt. Co. K, 161 Inf.	1233	17	20	C
Owens, Russell R.	Pvt. Co. B, 161 Inf.	1233	14	2	A
Owens, Walter H.	Pvt. Co. E, 161 Inf.	1233	24	3	A
Webster, Homer E.	Pvt. Co. M, 161 Inf.	1233	13	38	B
Albert, Clarence M.	Pvt. Co. K, 162 Inf.	1233	15	27	A
Borgford, Gudstein	Pvt. Co. B, 162 Inf.	608	18	17	C
Hasle, John	Pvt. Co. K, 162 Inf.	636	2	32	B
Johnson, Ted M.	Pvt. Co. D, 162 Inf.	1233	16	22	C
Altman, Edw. L.	Pvt. M. D. 147 M. G. Bn.	608	14	18	C
Utz, Chas. A.	Pvt. Co. C, 147 M. G. Bn.	1233	17	26	A
Lee, Walter C.	1 lt. 2 Bn. 146 F. A.	1232	10	22	F
Broikovich, Ivan	Pvt. Bty. E, 146 F. A.	1232	16	44	D
Starr, Frank J.	Pvt. M. D. 146 F. A.	1232	17	16	B
Stough, Arthur	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. F, 146 F. A.	1232	2	14	F
Howell, Fred	Pvt. Bty. B, 147 F. A.	1232	30	35	C
Kruger, Henry J.	Pvt. 1 Tn. Bty. 147 F. A.	34	22	15	A
Jerson, John A.	Sldr. Co. B, 116 Mil. Pol.	608	5	22	A
FORTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Gorfredson, Harry	Pvt. M. G. Co. 165 Inf.	608	22	1	B
Ward, Claud M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 165 Inf.	1232	14	41	D
Harvey, Lloyd A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 167 Inf.	608	2	7	B
Ash, Clark W.	Pvt. Co. F, 168 Inf.	1764	4	8	A

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SEVENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Backman, Bror S.	Pvt. Co. K, 305 Inf.	1232	34	6	A
Beck, Amos	do.	1232	30	3	A
Halvorson, Oscar	Pvt. Co. I, 305 Inf.	1232	25	4	A
Hand, Walter C.	do.	34	21	5	A
Kane, Jas.	Pvt. Co. G, 305 Inf.	1232	36	15	C
Lauritsen, Jas.	Pvt. Co. I, 305 Inf.	1232	35	37	F
Miller, Grover L.	Pvt. Co. M, 305 Inf.	1232	13	26	F
Morris, Wm.	do.	1232	23	3	C
Raison, Arthur	do.	1232	15	1	E
Sangston, Jos. J.	Pvt. Co. C, 305 Inf.	1232	20	42	D
Silversten, Ingvald J.	Pvt. Co. M, 305 Inf.	1232	7	17	G
Swank, Clarence E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 305 Inf.	1232	18	20	C
Winehart, Earl I.	Pvt. Co. E, 305 Inf.	1232	18	26	F
Brudwick, Christian J.	Pvt. Co. B, 306 Inf.	1232	1	16	B
Clare, Thos. J.	do.	1232	31	40	B
Edwinson, Carl E.	Pvt. Co. D, 306 Inf.	1232	25	29	G
Gerhauser, Carl F.	Pvt. Co. M, 306 Inf.	1232	23	42	F
Palmer, Tony	Pvt. Co. B, 306 Inf.	1232	21	23	F
Felt, Roy J.	Pvt. Co. M, 307 Inf.	1232	29	17	C
Flynn, Leo	do.	1232	36	36	H
Redburg, Jos.	Pvt. Co. G, 307 Inf.	1232	17	10	D
Pattison, Ramon S.	2 lt. 308 Inf.	1232	24	21	A
Brenner, Louis	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	1232	19	19	H
Gardiner, Elmer L.	Pvt. Co. M, 308 Inf.	1232	35	27	D
Hanson, Victor E.	Pvt. Co. H, 308 Inf.	1232	2	1	A
Henley, Clifford	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 308 Inf.	1232	14	32	G
Kelly, Kennedy K.	Pvt. Co. A, 308 Inf.	1232	30	8	B
Korussos, Stillianos	Pvt. Co. L, 308 Inf.	1232	21	18	A
Lilledale, Carl H.	do.	1232	35	29	H
Masse, Martin F.	Pvt. Co. G, 308 Inf.	1232	28	20	D
McKinney, Geo. H.	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	1232	4	6	F
Setwick, John	Pvt. Co. F, 308 Inf.	1232	27	10	F
SEVENTY-NINTH DIVISION					
Shannon, Charley E.	Pvt. Co. B, 313 Inf.	1232	1	3	B
Branson, Nelson L.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 314 Inf.	1232	37	18	H
EIGHTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Carson, Ben C.	Mech. M. G. Co., 322 Inf.	1233	16	3	D
Gish, Aaron K.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 322 Inf.	1232	34	26	D
Glidden, Roy D.	Pvt. Co. H, 322 Inf.	1233	2	13	B
EIGHTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Taylor, Frank H.	2 lt., 325 Inf.	1232	31	25	F
EIGHTY-THIRD DIVISION					
Armstrong, Almiron	Pvt. Bty. E, 324 F. A.	1233	4	15	D
EIGHTY-FOURTH DIVISION					
Anderson, Harold H.	Pvt. Co. H, 335 Inf.	34	6	4	A
NINETEENTH DIVISION					
Catlin, Melvin C.	Pvt. Co. I, 357 Inf.	1232	18	17	A
NINETY-FIRST DIVISION					
Lewis, Wilfred	Capt. QMC Hq.	608	13	28	D
Moser, Chas. J.	Hq. Det. 181 Inf. Brig.	1232	5	30	C
Betterton, Cherrill R.	1 lt. Co. E, 361 Inf.	1232	7	45	B
Anderson, Benj. N.	Pvt. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	9	20	D
Barr, Wm. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 361 Inf.	1232	23	39	C
Bauers, Frank E.	Cpl. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	29	30	G
Beach, Walter T.	Pvt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	25	12	G
Bendiksen, Bendik	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 361 Inf.	1232	12	43	C
Berndt, Julius	Cpl. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	38	19	D
Brending, Christof C. J.	Pvt. Co. E, 361 Inf.	1232	9	18	G
Bubbins, Walter S.	Cpl. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	12	25	A
Cariello, John G.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D. 361 Inf.	1232	22	27	C
Carlone, Michael	Pvt. Co. F, 361 Inf.	1232	31	27	B
Carlson, Carl M.	Mech. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	28	21	H
Clark, Don W.	Sgt. Co. E, 361 Inf.	1232	5	17	B
Davis, Samuel A., Jr.	Sgt. Co. F, 361 Inf.	1252	18	4	C
Dumas, Wilfred E.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 361 Inf.	1232	29	17	B
Enman, Guy C.	Cpl. Co. E, 361 Inf.	1232	11	10	C
Furzer, Reginald	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 361 Inf.	1232	6	34	D
Gaedecke, Edw. A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	6	44	D
Grono, Harry A.	Sup. Sgt., Co. K, 361 Inf.	1232	29	28	C
Hamlin, Glezen F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 361 Inf.	1232	27	18	E
Harlow, Arthur E.	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	6	25	D
Hess, Wm.	Pvt. Co. C, 361 Inf.	1232	18	4	D
Hill, Arthur	Pvt. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	4	21	D
Huckaba, Chas.	Sgt. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	5	5	D
Jacobsen, John A.	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	20	11	A
Johnson, Clarence C.	Cpl. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	23	35	E
Johnson, Henry J.	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	33	14	E
Johnson, Odin J.	Pvt. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	18	30	E
Johnson, Ole N.	Pvt. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	24	13	E
Johnson, Sam	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co. 361 Inf.	1232	37	26	H
Karpinski, Stanley	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 361 Inf.	636	3	6	A
Lancaster, Herschel C.	Sgt. Co. B, 361 Inf.	1232	36	14	A
Larsen, Ferdinand M.	Cpl. Co. G, 361 Inf.	1232	11	34	E
Larson, Budd C.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co. 361 Inf.	1232	15	42	B
Larson, Carl A.	Cpl. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	17	24	D
Larson, Daniel	Mech. Co. B, 361 Inf.	1232	22	25	D
Lindeborg, David M.	Cpl. Co. C, 361 Inf.	1232	26	46	B
Ludke, Paul F.	Pvt. Co. C, 361 Inf.	1232	30	4	A
Mack, Geo.	Pvt. Co. H, 361 Inf.	1232	39	38	F
Martin, Geo. L.	Cpl. Co. F, 361 Inf.	1232	6	46	A
Mastromonaco, Michele	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 361 Inf.	1252	3	3	B
Mazzone, Domenic	Pvt. Co. C, 361 Inf.	1232	3	38	H
McCarthy, Geo. F.	Sgt. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	4	20	E
Mead, Leland C.	Pvt. M. D., 361 Inf.	1232	3	2	C
Meyers, Bernard J.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 361 Inf.	1252	6	3	D
Müller, Harry J.	Pvt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	8	37	D

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NINETY-FIRST DIVISION—continued					
Nelson, Carl A.	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	19	32	H
O'Connor, Clement	Cook Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	10	1	A
Oliver, Matthew L.	Pvt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	37	37	H
Palmgren, Swan L.	Pvt. Co. H, 361 Inf.	1232	19	14	A
Paris, Apostolos P.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 361 Inf.	1232	37	34	A
Patten, Chas. W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 361 Inf.	1232	40	32	C
Perrine, Fred V. L.	Pvt. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	2	12	B
Peterson, Gustaf W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co., 361 Inf.	1232	37	5	F
Rathbun, Guy S.	Sgt. Co. K, 361 Inf.	1232	16	35	F
Rees, John	Sgt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	23	18	G
Requa, Harry E.	Pvt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	5	4	C
Ringhand, Herman	do	1232	2	32	B
Ronning, Sigurd	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	20	30	B
Root, Daniel W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 361 Inf.	1232	13	35	B
Safer, Frank	Pvt. Co. F, 361 Inf.	608	14	21	A
Satterberg, Victor E.	Pvt. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	35	5	E
Schneider, John A.	Cpl. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	2	37	A
Seamans, Harry	Pvt. Co. I, 361 Inf.	1232	5	40	A
Shelse, Tom	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	11	34	A
Simonsen, Simon	Pvt. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	11	12	H
Smith, Verne M.	Cpl. Co. L, 361 Inf.	1232	31	10	E
Smyth, Thos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	35	42	B
Sullivan, Elmer M.	Pvt. Co. F, 361 Inf.	608	2	19	D
Therkildsen, Niels	Pvt. M. G. Co., 361 Inf.	1232	21	22	E
Twerdale, Barney J.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 361 Inf.	1232	35	44	D
Verrell, Cecil L.	Cpl. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	29	33	F
Waltersdorf, Max A.	Pvt. Co. M, 361 Inf.	1232	28	38	G
Williams, Thos. O.	Cpl. Co. D, 361 Inf.	1232	7	23	A
Zanon, John	Pvt. M. G. Co., 361 Inf.	1232	2	38	B
Worham, Elijah W.	Capt. 362 Inf.	1232	25	39	C
McCleverty, Adelbert D.	2 lt. Co. G, 362 Inf.	1232	19	18	E
Berlich, Dominick	Pvt. Co. B, 362 Inf.	1232	2	3	E
Cameron, Thos.	Mech. Co. C, 362 Inf.	1232	15	14	F
Fiorito, Crescenzo	Pvt. Co. C, 362 Inf.	1232	26	4	C
Gentry, Clarence W.	Pvt. Co. M, 362 Inf.	1232	22	30	E
Hughes, Thos.	Pvt. Co. A, 362 Inf.	1232	28	18	B
Hutsiniller, Chester E.	Pvt. Co. C, 362 Inf.	1232	8	28	G
Johnson, Jos. E.	Cpl. Co. B, 362 Inf.	1232	30	17	E
Martin, Louis A.	Pvt. Co. G, 362 Inf.	1232	23	34	F
Voltonn, John	Pvt. Co. E, 362 Inf.	1232	29	35	A
Wik, Andrew	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 362 Inf.	1232	10	2	G
Carlson, Thos.	Pvt. Co. L, 363 Inf.	1232	12	35	H
Condon, Edw. J.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 363 Inf.	1232	2	1	A
Dalrymple, John	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 363 Inf.	1232	24	33	H
Diver, Alva E.	Pvt. Co. M, 363 Inf.	1232	21	4	A
Stubbs, Edward	Pvt. Co. G, 363 Inf.	1232	38	26	G
Wattelet, Leonard A.	Capt. Co. A, 364 Inf.	1232	22	2	A
Noble, Elmer J.	1 lt. Co. D, 364 Inf.	1232	33	17	H
Christen, Henry A.	Pvt. M. D., 364 Inf.	1232	36	12	A
King, Benj. H.	Pvt. Co. D, 364 Inf.	1232	30	17	C
Martin, Voyle B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 364 Inf.	1232	14	37	E
Noyer, John E.	Pvt. Co. G, 364 Inf.	1232	35	35	F
Olson, Oscar	Pvt. Co. F, 364 Inf.	1232	13	38	G
Watson, Arthur E.	Pvt. Co. I, 364 Inf.	608	27	38	D
Wheeler, Logan	Cpl. Co. D, 364 Inf.	1232	27	43	G
Young, Harold H.	Pvt. Co. B, 364 Inf.	1232	2	23	D
Newland, Chas. J.	1 lt. Co. C, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	16	19	E
Austin, Samuel F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 347 M. G. Bn.	608	16	38	D
Bracken, Robt.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	9	40	E
Kennedy, Richard	Cpl. Co. A, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	4	5	E
Lentz, Peter	Pvt. Co. C, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	23	4	C
Olsen, Edwin E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	16	25	H
Patton, Darrell V.	Pvt. Co. C, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	10	1	F
Richardson, Chas. T.	Sgt. Co. C, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	36	10	E
Sonville, Ernest A.	Pvt. Co. B, 347 M. G. Bn.	1232	19	2	A
Sunde, Jacob	do	1232	34	20	A
Thompson, Geo. C.	do	1232	38	16	C
Vogel, Lewis	do	1232	34	27	C
Roberts, Byron B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 348 M. G. Bn.	1232	33	31	H
Bloom, Bengt M.	Pvt. Co. A, 316 Engrs.	1232	30	9	E
Chimienti, Michele	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 316 Engrs.	1232	8	1	D
Dye, Ronald E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 316 Engrs.	132	30	5	E
Olds, Roscoe C.	Cpl. Co. C, 316 Engrs.	1232	36	15	F
Saylor, Herbert M.	Pvt. Co. A, 316 Engrs.	1232	27	11	G
Parker, Paul E.	Sgt. 1 cl. Co. B, 316 F. S. Bn.	608	27	10	D
Roder, Wm. A.	Pvt. 362 Amb. Co. 316 Sn. Tn.	1232	9	4	B
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS					
Dunbar, Walter C.	Sgt. Hq. 1 Army	1233	16	18	C
Stavropoulos, Vlases	Pvt. 1 cl. Tp. B, Hq. 1 Army	1233	26	17	B
Turner, Henry E.	1 lt. 20 Aero Sq.	1232	28	16	G
Kinney, Clair A.	1 lt. 49 Aero Sq.	1232	37	29	E
Hinkamp, Ted. H.	Pvt. 140 Aero Sq.	107-E	5	9	D
Hagstrom, Erick	Cook 163 Aero Sq.	1233	24	7	A
Long, Jas. A.	Pvt. 166 Aero Sq.	1232	27	44	O
Grill, Wm. F.	Cpl. 658 Aero Sq.	34	31	7	B
Taylor, Albert B.	Pvt. 875 Aero Sq.	1232	32	40	C
Saunders, Herbert	Rgl. Sgt. Maj. Hq. Det. Base Sec. 1 A. S. C.	608	34	14	C
Potter, Jess L.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 62 C. A. C.	34	30	14	A
Anderson, Chris	Mess Sgt. Bty. F, 65 C. A. C.	1233	34	16	D
Carlson, Arthur J.	Cpl. Bty. F, 65 C. A. C.	34	35	11	A
Uddenberg, Herman	Wag. Bty. F, 65 C. A. C.	1233	30	8	B
Allen, Jas. F.	Pvt. B. H. 10 M. D.	636	5	22	A
Wright, Fred S.	Pvt. 536 Mt. Tk. Co. M. S. Tn.	608	30	32	A
Watts, Cecil F.	Pvt. B. H. 29, M. D.	107-E	14	3	B

Deceased soldiers from Washington buried in cemeteries in Europe—Con.

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—CON.					
Kantner, Wm. C.	1 lt. B. H. 50, M. D.	1233	14	1	C
Parker, Samuel	Pvt. B. H. 50, M. D.	1233	35	25	A
Nesser, Edw. J.	Pvt. B. H. 54, M. D.	1233	14	21	A
Breen, John J.	Pvt. Evac. Hosp. 1, M. D.	1233	32	27	C
Hyde, Colin C.	Pvt. Co. B, M. T. C.	34	32	12	B
Abrams, Arthur T.	Pvt. Co. A, 308 M. T. C.	1233	18	3	A
Braddon, Harold B.	Cpl. Overhaul Pk., M. T. C.	34	22	9	B
Duckett, Lloyd O.	Pvt. 1 cl. No. 312 Unit, M. T. C.	34	10	22	A
Wheeler, Leon H.	1 lt. Ord. Dept.	(1)	18	33	B
Bromley, Dewey V.	Pvt. Tp. I, 15 Cav.	608	15	33	B
Lawson, Chas., Jr.	Pvt. Co. A, 1 Gas Regt.	608	15	33	B
Mely, Arthur C.	Pvt. Co. F, 1 Gas Regt.	1232	18	9	D
Gough, Arthur W.	Capt. Co. B, 317 F. S. Bn. S. C.	1232	28	28	A
Wiley, Benedict T.	Sgt. 1 cl. 35 Sig. Co. S. C.	34	38	7	B
Erickson, Peter	Pvt. Co. D, 18 Engrs.	34	20	3	A
Ward, Homer Wilber	1 lt. 20 Engrs.	34	5	23	A
Durward, Allan J.	Pvt. Co. E, 20 Engrs.	608	8	18	C
Kloekars, John	Pvt. 33 Co. 20 Engrs.	34	16	6	A
Nelson, Albert W.	Pvt. Co. F, 20 Engrs.	608	10	38	B
Queen, Jas. R.	Pvt. 28 Co. 20 Engrs.	1764	14	11	B
Solberg, Edwin M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 20 Engrs.	1232	25	39	D
Warren, Robt. F.	Pvt. Co. D, 20 Engrs.	107-E	4	4	A
Swanson, Nels G.	Pvt. 1 cl. 11 Co. 20 Engrs.	1232	13	35	C
Weagant, Frank Gilbert	Pvt. Tk. Co. S, 23 Engrs.	34	37	5	B
Blee, Robt. C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Det., 31 Engrs.	34	12	4	C
Dorre, Manuel	Sdlr. Co. A, 32 Engrs.	34	16	11	A
Melville, Isaac L.	Pvt. Co. E, 57 Engrs.	608	36	21	C
Leonard, John W.	Cpl. 447 Engrs.	1232	25	5	H
Coffield, Fred	Elec. 3 cl. U. S. N.	608	7	26	C
Osterberg, Holgar August	App. Sm. U. S. N.	608	8	21	D
English, John L.	Capt. Co. C, 344 Bn. T. C.	1232	26	7	A
Kildow, Math S.	Pvt. Cas. Co. B, Tk. Cps.	107-E	1	1	C

1 To be interred.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, ladies, and gentlemen of the House, as has just been said by my colleague from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY], the press of the country has been filled very thoroughly of late with the activities on the international border both of rum runners and of those designated by this Government to protect the border from contraband. There is a very serious condition before the country. It seems to me we need to deal with this matter in the most careful and most calm manner.

It is not a new thing that liquor should make an insurrection or should attempt to precipitate a civil war. The pages of history of our Nation reveal the fact that the forces of the Government were called out early to quell a similar rebellion instigated by liquor. When we attempt to deal with a great traffic at whose base is appetite and greed we have a very serious problem confronting us.

But I stand here in the well of the House and plead that this House shall give to the Government's enforcement officers the same moral support as is seemingly given, according to the remarks of a few, to the rum runners and liquor traffickers in this so-called contraband. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CLANCY], who addressed the House a moment ago, not on the floor of the House but through the press of the country, made a statement to the effect that he was going back to Detroit to find out about the incident of the shooting of an innocent youth by a customs patrolman. Yet when he got to Detroit he found that that innocent youth, who he said was going down the river to catch pickerel at 1.30 o'clock in the morning, was one of a group that had just left a boat laden with 35 cases of liquor that had been abandoned at the approach of the Government guard, and was then slipping down the river to find out whether he could not recapture the abandoned boat laden with liquor. He was not an innocent youth, as depicted in the newspapers. The report went all over the country that "a poor, innocent youth" had been shot. He was a rum runner.

Mr. SIMMONS. They are all supposed to be innocent when first apprehended, are they not?

Mr. HUDSON. That seems to be so. Now I want to read to you from an editorial from the Detroit Free Press of June 11, under the heading "Mr. CLANCY'S Tirade." I read:

MR. CLANCY'S TIRADE

The statements made by Representative ROBERT H. CLANCY, in commenting on the plans of the Treasury Department for fighting the

rum runners along the Detroit River, sound unpleasantly like a studied effort to stir up prejudice against, and opposition to, the Federal Prohibition, Customs, and Coast Guard authorities, who are combining in an effort to perform a duty placed upon them by the Constitution of the United States. We do not see how any milder interpretation can be placed upon such rabid assertions as these: "From time immemorial soldiery imposed on a civilian population has been tyrannical, and a portion of the soldiery are always venal, drunken, brutal, or lawless. * * * The people of Detroit must be alert to save their river and lakes for themselves during this incursion of the soldiery."

The prohibition laws as they stand are unfortunately framed. The sooner they can be modified in an orderly way the better. But for the present they are on the books, and it is the business of the Government to enforce them. Even covert suggestion that the Government is perpetrating an abuse in so doing is so reprehensible an action that we will not try to characterize it.

Unquestionably there have been abuses in connection with the endeavors of the Washington Government to enforce provisions of the Volstead Act, some of them exceedingly bad abuses, amounting to murder, and the failure of justice in dealing with the perpetrators is a public reproach. But these abuses have arisen in part because of the attitude of men in responsible positions who speak and think as Mr. CLANCY speaks and presumably thinks. On their side of the fence, these men are just as bad as the Bishop Cannons are on the other.

I plead with you this morning that this House, the highest legislative body in the world, should stand for order and stand with the President of the United States for bringing about law observance, and not for anything else. [Applause.]

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. HUDSON. Not now. I think the gentleman has already had his time on this question. I will yield later.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. I wanted to ask the gentleman a very brief question.

Mr. HUDSON. You have had your time.

What I want to bring out this morning is the fact that the Government and the people of this Nation are facing a definite crisis in this matter of lawlessness and crime. Shall it be the part of we men in Congress by our spoken word to encourage the further spread of lawlessness by denouncing our Government officers?

I regret some of the unfortunate tragedies that always have occurred and always will occur in the detection and prevention of crime. I deeply regret that there has always been men placed in charge of enforcement of law during a crisis who perhaps lose their head, and tragedies occur; but I do insist that in most of the cases which have been so recently widely discussed that when the facts are investigated carefully and in the light of sanity, there have been mitigating circumstances which have caused the officers to go their limit.

I repeat, Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, that there is a propaganda abroad which only leads to further violence and crime. I hold in my hand a letter signed by Robert J. Caldwell, with a New York City address, that is printed on a copy press paper sent to me through the mail, which seems to be a copy of a letter sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, and evidently is put out by some organization for propaganda purposes. At the left-hand corner of this copy, underscored and in different type, evidently afterwards placed thereon, are the words, "Governmental murder." I will insert the entire letter.

NEW YORK, N. Y., June 12, 1929.

GOVERNMENTAL MURDER

HONORABLE SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY,

Washington, D. C.

SIR: I desire to register my righteous indignation and holy wrath at this free-for-all legalized murder on the part of the Government of innocent people under the guise of enforcement of the prohibition act, which apparently does not prohibit murder on the part of the Government.

I protest against this un-American practice as unfair, for Americans will never stand for anything that is unfair. If it is within the law for prohibition officers to shoot up innocent citizens, then damn the law! The least that can be allowed under such circumstances is that the innocent have a chance with the bully who carries a Government badge. They should be permitted to stand up and shoot it out—certainly the innocent should have an equal chance with the guilty.

In the West they have a term that fittingly describes such procedure as is now going on, namely, "a tin-horn sport." Is the Government "a tin-horn sport"?

In former days, when we had an outlaw class in the West, the good citizens of the West formed a vigilantes committee to shoot up the

unruly and made their inquiries afterwards. This is what is going to happen under the present circumstances if it continues, and is bad business for the Government to be engaged in.

I am a considerable taxpayer under this Government, and I have a right to know how my money is being used by those whose salaries I help to pay. This wholly contemptible procedure goes farther to promote lawlessness in this country than any other single thing that I know of. We have got to come to an understanding on this situation and quickly. The American people are not putty men to stand for any such gross misuse of power as we have in this sort of outlawry under the patronage and support of the Government.

I am a lifelong Republican, but I don't stand for this sort of thing under my party or any other party, and neither do the people at large. If the Republican Party wants to wreck itself, it is certainly traveling the high road to disaster in countenancing these high-handed proceedings. Murder is murder, whether by the Government or anyone else, and the people of this country are not going to stand idly by and see the United States Balkanized.

Faithfully yours,

ROBERT J. CALDWELL.

I will also put into the RECORD a news statement carried in the daily press of Thursday, June 13, headed "Lakes Rum Runners Unite to Fight U. S." With the further headline, "Giant Combine Perfected at Ecorse Meeting to Combat Government Agencies."

LAKES RUM RUNNERS UNITE TO FIGHT U. S.—GIANT COMBINE PERFECTED AT ECORSE MEETING TO COMBAT GOVERNMENT AGENCIES

Formation of a giant combine of Great Lakes rum runners, to challenge the antimuggling agencies of the Federal Government, from Buffalo to Mackinaw, was completed yesterday in Ecorse at a secret meeting of big operators from all important points of entry on the border, it was learned last night.

The rum chiefs worked out plans for a shuttle system, whereby the traffic will be diverted to Lake Erie or Lake Huron whenever the coast guard border patrol and other dry units are concentrated on the Detroit River.

Headquarters have been established at strategic points along the border, and these points will be held in readiness to go into operation whenever the waterways fronting them are comparatively free from Federal interference.

DEVISE INTELLIGENCE SYSTEM

The operators have devised an extraordinarily widespread and apparently efficient intelligence system whereby the leaders of the giant combine are always aware of what stretches of the border are under the heaviest guard and at what point danger from interruption is, for the moment, relatively remote.

An indication that plans for the combine and the new shuttle system of smuggling have been under consideration for some time is furnished by a survey of Ecorse, Trenton, and Wyandotte boat wells along the river. Speed boats, the favorite smuggling craft a few months ago, are being offered for sale at prices below any that obtained until the recent concentration of Coast Guard patrol craft on the river.

To replace the outmoded speed boats, which would be of little use to combat the heavy seas on Lakes Erie and Huron, runners are refitting tugs, ranging in length from 60 to 80 feet. These craft are being almost completely rebuilt.

INSTALL LARGER MOTORS

Larger motors are being installed on them, to give them greater speed. Their deck houses are being taken off so that there will be as little of the boat as possible to project up into the glare of the searchlights carried by the Coast Guard boats. The steering wheels are being placed in a cockpit so the helmsman's head appears only a few inches above the level of the deck.

The rebuilt tugs, their builders believe, are sufficiently heavy to withstand the pounding of any seas that may be kicked up on the Lakes and will have sufficient speed to get across on schedule.

Down-river rum runners admitted yesterday that liquor smuggling on the Detroit River has been practically at a standstill for the last two or three days. Yesterday and the day before, they said, two border patrol boats have been stationed in the Ecorse Channel, which swings closely in to the American shore.

These boats, they declared, have stopped every boat of every kind, whether fishing or rum-carrying craft. The result was that if any liquor seeped across the border it was only in negligible quantities. At the same time, the runners said, smuggling has been going on as before on the upper reaches of Lake St. Clair and across the St. Clair River.

There were rumors current down river, however, that guards were being placed in larger details on the upper river, in which case the leakage there is likely to be dammed. Down-river smugglers maintained

that Buffalo runners were cruising back and forth across the border at their end with almost no let or hindrance.

While few runners were willing to declare flatly that the Federal Government can not stop smuggling along the border if sufficient forces are unleashed, they generally insisted that there will always be enough loopholes or leaks to make smuggling a profitable, though risky, performance.

In any case, the leaders in the new rum merger apparently feel they will be able to clean up goodly profits before the Government has reached the point where it can, or will, place an armed guard, shoulder to shoulder along the entire length of the international boundary line.

In view of these two quotations, can anyone say that we must not measure our words in order that we do not further incite a condition of lawlessness? When one reads of this armed force, who stop at no consideration for life, who, when necessity for gain seems to demand will line their own confederates up against a wall and shoot them down as cattle, as they did in the Chicago massacre, are we to ask our representatives to stand with folded arms and bid the rum runner and thug to smite them on the one cheek and then turn the other for a second slap?

Mr. Speaker, I am not pleading for indiscriminate shooting; I am pleading that the men employed by this Government to enforce its laws may have a square deal and not be hung until judgment can be arrived at sanely and coolly.

Ladies and gentlemen of this House, what are we trying to protect? Homes, families, children, business, yes, Government itself—or the illicit, illegal liquor traffic. Can any man in all the history of the liquor traffic show me anything that has come out of it that is worth protecting? Can any man or any woman in all the history of this Nation show me where this traffic that is to-day defying the Government of the United States has ever brought to pass anything that has been worth while to the Government? Always it has been called an outlaw, and always has it been recognized as something that we would not advertise in our own communities and yet we come here, true only a few, but as the press carries it it would seem as though this entire Congress took the same position, and cry for defense of violators and denounce our officers. I have in my hand here an editorial from the New York World, in which it is said, "Most of the Members of Congress are drinking women and men." I resent this. I say that most of the Members of the Congress, the women and the men, are law-abiding, decent, citizens of this country [applause] and I resent the attacks that are made in the well of this House that produce and will produce a more serious condition than we have to-day before the country.

I understand that there are some men who stand here and make these pronouncements for political reasons. They think they must go back to a constituency that is wet and be known as the mouthpiece of the wet interests on the floor of the House. I pity such a person if there be one and if they have that kind of district. The men who vote for me are the ones who punch the time clock in the factories, but I serve you notice that I have said before these same workmen in all the great factory cities of my district and in the city of Detroit—and I have as many votes in the metropolitan district of Detroit in my district as has the gentleman who has just preceded me—I have said to them that if they send me to Congress I shall stand for law and order and for the things that mean the upholding of the Government.

You do not have to appeal to such things. I appeal to the better instincts of every man and every woman in this crisis hour of this Nation of ours that we stand by the President and stand by his plea for law enforcement and law observance. [Applause.]

THE GOLDEN RULE IN AMERICAN-FILIPINO RELATIONS

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech delivered this day before the Southern Tariff Association.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from the Philippines asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The speech follows:

Mr. OSIAS. I am appreciative of the invitation extended to me to address the agricultural commissioners representing the Southern States and others at this meeting held under the auspices of the Southern Tariff Association. I am sensible that this association is one of the

12 organizations responsible for a recent circular widely distributed containing the following reference to the Philippines:

"The bill [tariff] also denies to the agricultural producers of the United States any measure of protection against products imported from the Philippine Islands. This denial was made in the face of the legal right to impose such duties, although the principle is admitted and declared in the bill. The continued granting of such privileges to residents of the Philippine Islands at the expense of our agriculture constitutes one of the important obstacles to our agriculture becoming normal and regaining its rightful share of the national income.

"We also ask that title 3, section 301, of the bill be so changed as to make dutiable agricultural products of the Philippines imported into this country with the understanding that the revenues thus derived shall be segregated and turned into the treasury of the Philippine Government."

I therefore doubly appreciate your invitation because it is prompted by a generous spirit. I wish at the outset to say that the people of the Philippines, including the Americans, are against the present movement calculated to impose duties on our products or place limitations upon Philippine exports coming to the United States at least while the American flag waves over those isles.

I accepted the invitation with alacrity, because I saw in it a challenge and an opportunity. I have always enjoyed being close to my friends as well as my adversaries. I take it that I am now face to face with friends and adversaries at this meeting. It shall be my endeavor to demonstrate that there is absolutely no valid reason why the Philippines should find adversaries in a group representing the Southern Tariff Association, and that there is every reason why you and all true Americans should be staunch friends of the Philippine people.

The excerpt from the circular above referred to consists of two paragraphs. The first paragraph consists of three sentences; the second of one sentence. The first and third sentences are based upon a wrong assumption. They are predicated upon the premise that the agricultural producers of the Philippines are the natural enemies of the agricultural producers of the United States. This I do not admit. I contend that the producers and the consumers of both countries are not enemies but allies.

Wherein, I ask you, is the conflict? I suppose the answer that readily comes to you now is that there is danger because of two of our products, principally sugar and coconut. Let us reason together as friends.

America is essentially a temperate country. The Philippines is a tropical country. Our products rather than being competitive and inimical are essentially supplementary and complementary. We want your products; you need ours. Must there be a conflict? Is that the course dictated by reason and statesmanship?

Let me be more concrete. A great deal has been said and written of late regarding the supposed menace of Philippine sugar to the beet and cane sugar industry in the United States. I hope to convince you that even here there is no antagonism. The people of the United States each year consume in the neighborhood of 5,297,050 long tons. These figures represent the consumption in this country for 1927. Louisiana furnished 0.74 per cent of the total; United States beet sugar was 14.74 per cent of the total; various other sugars of continental United States made up 0.02 per cent of the total. Cuba furnished 54.99 per cent and other foreign countries 0.11 per cent. The Philippine Islands furnished only 8.20 per cent.

Now, I ask what sources do you need to fear? Surely not the Philippine Islands, where your own flag is sovereign to-day, which furnishes but an insignificant fraction of what you need—and remember that 76 per cent of the capital investment in the Philippine industry is controlled by Americans and Filipinos. Even supposing that the Philippines will increase her production, she will not be able to furnish but a minor part of what you consume, and any increase that may in the future be registered will hardly satisfy the normal yearly increase in sugar consumption in the United States.

One more point I wish to bring out. The market for Philippine sugar in the United States is the Atlantic seaboard mainly. Continental beet and cane sugar is marketed chiefly in the South, in the Middle West, and in the West. I tell you we are allies, not enemies. All the propaganda of the last few months depicting the alleged menace of Philippine sugar is but a smoke screen calculated to mislead the American people as to the real source of danger.

Let me pass to another point. We in the Philippine Islands grow coconuts. You do not. You in the South grow cotton. We do not. I think there is need of a considerable stretch of the imagination to perceive the existence of a dangerous economic conflict between the Southern States and the Philippines. We in the Philippines to-day are about the greatest purchasers of your cotton products. Cotton

manufactures occupy the first place among our principal imports from the United States. In 1927 we imported cotton products in the amount of over \$12,000,000. You furnished these products. Every man, woman, or child in the Philippines is spending over \$1 each year for your cotton products. The potential purchasing power will grow each year. We take what you produce in abundance. We send you what we produce but which you do not grow. Is not this the essence of modern trade and commerce? Has it come to such a pass that trade and commerce should be instruments of trouble and not of harmony among peoples under the same flag?

But I seem to sense that some are thinking of the conflict between cottonseed oil and coconut oil. Here, some of you say, is a real conflict of economic interests. The total amount of coconut oil and oil in copra available in the islands a year is about 230,000 tons. The consumption of these oils in the United States annually is about 270,000 tons. The coconut oil is used chiefly for the making of soap. The kinds of oil used are becoming more specialized. Because of the importation of coconut oil to this country a great deal more of the cottonseed oil you produce has been utilized for edible trades, thereby enabling you to command better prices and reap greater profits. Cottonseed oil is a by-product. You have now an overproduction of cotton. To increase cottonseed-oil production is to endanger your major interest. I should add that we are among your best customers for your meat products and your dairy products, consisting of butter, cheese, and milk. It is clearly to the interests of Americans to enhance, not to cripple, the purchasing power of the inhabitants of the Philippine Islands.

So much for the wrong premise that there is conflict between the agricultural producers of the United States and the people of the Philippines. Let me turn your attention to the second sentence, which says: "This denial was made in the face of the legal right to impose such duties * * *." In the tariff hearings some have pressed this contention. I admit that the United States has the legal right to impose duties. If I did not admit this, I would not be here and in Congress voicing the opposition of the Philippine people. If you did not have the legal right, there would be no need of protesting.

But let me ask the conscience of America: Admitting as I do that you have the legal right to impose duties on Philippine products, do you have the moral right? It is unthinkable that there should be any American, conscious of his country's past and proud of the history of his people's love of fairness, claiming that America has the moral right to impose duties upon Philippine products coming to this country when we are absolutely powerless to legislate on matters affecting tariff relations between America and the Philippines. Under the present status of the Philippines, only the American Congress has this legal right. You have known this fact. You have the legal right to impose the most exorbitant duties upon Philippine exports to this country. We are without power to levy duties of any kind upon American products sent to the Philippines. As long as the American flag waves over the Philippine Islands, American agricultural and industrial products will go to my country duty free and without limit. I ask you, in the name of right and fairness and justice, does America have the moral right to impose duties upon Philippine products or place limitations upon our exports to this country?

Let us now take up the second paragraph I quoted from your circular. In view of what I have said, is there still one among you who, jealous of America's honor, will invoke the legal right and the power and the strength of America to levy duty upon the products of a defenseless people who, by the fortunes of war, came under the protection of your Stars and Stripes? Of course, there is a plausible qualification in the statement which gives some semblance of fairness. I refer to this phrase: " * * * with the understanding that the revenues thus derived shall be segregated and turned over into the Treasury of the Philippine Government." That seems fair. It is not right. It is violative of a principle. You are also proposing to convert us into objects of charity. This is indefensible. If you have the right to send your products to my country duty free and without limit, that right ought to carry with it the corresponding obligation in full measure to reciprocate. Such is my understanding of American justice from my study of America's history and American institutions. I trust that your action and the action of Congress will not disillusion me and the millions of my people across the sea.

I wish I had more time, but I do not wish unduly to prolong this discussion. The record of the hearings of the Ways and Means Committee is replete with facts, figures, and statements which may well serve as the basis of judgment with respect to the economic relations that should exist between the United States and the Philippines. I will just add some bits of information. The principal imports of the Philippines from the United States are: Cotton manufactures, iron and steel and manufactures of same, gasoline, kerosene, and lubricating oil, automobiles and parts of same, wheat flour, meat and dairy products, paper and manufactures of same, silk and manufactures of same, and rubber goods. Our principal exports to the United States are: Cen-

trifugal sugar, coconut oil, copra, hemp, cigars, lumber, and hats. The mere enumeration of these articles of imports and exports should be convincing proof of what I contended at the outset, namely, that we have products that you need and you have products that we want, and that the products of this temperate country and those of that distant tropical country are not inimical but essentially supplementary and complementary.

Another information. The Philippines is not now and will never be a 1-crop country. Philippine agriculture is well diversified. To prove this let me present a few figures. In 1927 the area planted to rice was 4,465,000 acres; corn, 3,387,000 acres; coconuts, 1,236,000 acres; manila hemp, 1,058,000 acres; sugar cane, 586,000 acres. Unlike other sugar-producing islands the Philippines is by no means a single-crop country, because, compared with the area planted to sugar cane, about eight times as much land is used for the cultivation of rice, about three times as much is used for corn, twice as much for coconuts or hemp.

Before I close permit me to invite your attention to two outstanding facts: First, the future of American trade is of greatest promise with the peoples of the Pacific; second, the success of the development of American trade and commerce in the Far East is dependent chiefly upon the friendship and good will of the people more than upon any other factor. I think every fair-minded man will admit the truth of these facts. I consider it unnecessary to speak at length clarifying points which are so self-evident. I sometimes wonder whether Americans in general are fully awake to their opportunities in the Orient. Do all of you know that in 1913 America's import and export trade in Asia and Australasia amounted to \$485,000,000 and that in 1927, or only 14 years afterwards, it reached the great sum of \$2,744,000,000? Have you ever stopped to realize that a great deal of this is due to the understanding and friendship existing among the peoples there by virtue of the policy of altruism which America announced at the inception of her occupation of the Philippines?

It is claimed that the Philippine people have been greatly benefited by American rule. I am among the first to admit it, and there is no disposition on the part of my people to begrudge credit where credit is due. Yet I trust it will not be deemed unseemly on my part to remind you that America has likewise been greatly benefited by her contact with us not only because of the great benefits that have accrued to you in terms of dollars but in terms of good will and friendship.

That you may the better realize America's opportunity in the Orient, permit me to quote the following words of Capt. Robert Dollar, president of the Dollar Steamship Lines:

" * * * If, somewhere in the United States, a new city were to spring suddenly into existence—a city of, let us say, 500,000 inhabitants, in which the houses were without water supply, electricity, or telephones; where there were no pavements, sewers, typewriters, or street cars; where horses and donkeys were the fastest means of traveling; and where seventeenth, sixteenth, and even tenth century methods still prevailed—what would happen? Millions of dollars would be spent to rush branch railway lines to that city. Motor highways would be laid down to connect it with the rest of the country. Even before these plans could be completed an army of salesmen would flood that city, on foot if need be, and from every State in the Union, and would almost smother it.

"Magnify this imaginary market a thousand times, move it from America to Asia, and you have a brief but fairly accurate picture of the possibilities which exist in the Orient for the development of foreign trade."

Nothing will hasten the realization of this dream for America than the continuation of a policy of justice and fairness with us. What America does in the Philippines is interpreted throughout the Far East as a manifestation of America's true spirit. So thoroughly do I believe in this that I simply fail to understand how even now propagandists of special interests are already shaking the confidence of millions of potential customers in our part of the globe by announcements that the farmers of this country "have just begun the battle against competition from the Philippines." The mere presentation of measures discriminatory to America's wards has not helped business. It has caused incalculable harm.

Furthermore, it has once again demonstrated to the Philippine people that the present status of their country is unsatisfactory and anomalous. Many are beginning to wonder whether the protestations with respect to the promotion of our liberty and our prosperity are not after all based upon a foundation of quicksand. Yet we have in the past proven true and loyal to America because of our unshakable faith in her glorious traditions and in her sacred promise. When the world was undergoing a catastrophic upheaval and America was drawn into the World War circumstances compelled you to withdraw practically all your forces from Philippine shores. Conscious that you were then fighting for a great principle of national and international life, convinced that you were fighting for the rights and liberties of small nations, we in those trying days of the Great War clung to you with

filial affection. We recalled the promises of your Executives that America came to our country not to exploit but to liberate us. We remembered the policy toward the Philippines oftentimes reiterated in the platforms of the political parties of this country. We kept in mind America's sacred promise to grant us our independence bearing the sanction both of the legislative and executive branches of this great Government. We never lost sight of the principles of the great Magna Charta of American liberties. Will you now permit in these days of peace that any step shall be taken that shall be interpreted as a complete reversal of your avowed policy? As the official spokesman of my people I can not believe that America will take steps not conducive to the life, liberty, and happiness of the people inhabiting those beautiful isles of the Pacific poetically known as the Pearl of the Orient Seas.

From various quarters, in the course of this tariff discussion, we notice the cry of menace to your industries from Cuba and the Philippines. Time and again have I heard and read my beloved dependent country placed in the same category with the independent countries for economic purposes. In all candor I say this is unfair, illogical, unjustifiable. Place us first on an independent basis politically before you treat the Philippines as an independent country economically.

My plea is for the observance of the Golden Rule in American-Philippine relations. We in the Philippines wish to see you Christian people in the West ever happy, prosperous, and free. Do you wish us Christian people in the East any less? I prefer not to believe it. Then, you can not be the enemies but the friends of the people of the Philippines. Economically and politically, citizens of America, as ye would that others do unto you, I pray, do ye unto the Filipinos likewise.

PROHIBITION

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAGUARDIA. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have asked for these few minutes because the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] made a statement which I believe ought not to go unanswered. I do not believe there is any Member of the House, wet or dry, who is not seeking to do all he can for law enforcement. The criticism we are making is that the enforcement of this particular law seemingly requires a disregard of law. That is the situation. We ought to be able to discuss this very important question and get away from personalities and the make-up of any Member's district. No one can say who knows my record that at any time I have refused to vote for appropriations for the enforcement of the law and in fact I have always asked for more appropriations. But the question that confronts us to-day is not the wet or dry issue. It is a question of what we are going to do with a law that seemingly requires utter disregard of law to enforce it. Here is the widow Wirkkula and what does she say? I am reading from a news item in to-day's Washington Daily News. She says—

It just does not seem right, because the poor boy who shot at us and killed Henry really is not to blame; he is the law. My husband and the brother with whom I live voted dry at the last election.

That tells the story. "He is the law."

Now, gentlemen, if four or five men get together and conspire to fix prices on any commodity in restraint of trade and they are discovered and then attempt to run away you would not justify shooting at them and killing them. The law which prohibits the fixing of prices is a *malum prohibitum*, a statutory offense, just as the transportation or sale of liquor is only a statutory offense. It does not involve moral turpitude. It is not a repulsive crime; it is a statutory offense.

If a man were violating the banking law and seeks to run away, a mere misdemeanor, or under the agricultural law he was caught bringing in seeds and plants that he ought not to bring in you would not shoot him dead.

So, gentlemen, be sensible about this thing. As I said the other day, it is going to lead us into serious trouble, because I fear that somewhere, at some time, in some place, the people will resent these indiscriminate and unjustifiable killings and we will have serious trouble.

That is the question, and that is what we want to have investigated—whether or not it requires men to be armed with shotguns and machine guns, and whether it requires an armed force to enforce this particular law. I do not believe you can refer to any law on the statute books that requires such kind of enforcement. I can not think of one. The narcotic law has a solid public opinion back of it, and we have no trouble about

it. All the people are back of it. There is seemingly a great demand for liquor in the country, otherwise there would not be any market for it. So, gentlemen, do not put all the blame on the rum runner. True, he is violating the law; but unless there was a ready-cash market, unless there was an enormous demand for liquor we would not have the thousands of rum runners. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] criticizes the New York World. I am sure the New York World requires no defense. I will say, though, that it is rendering a great public service in the fight that it is waging against prohibition in showing up the absurdities of the law and the impossibility of its enforcement. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that we have had five or six oratorical displays here from gentlemen on the other side and none on this, and I suggest that we take the rest of the day to get recruited. [Laughter.]

MASSACHUSETTS SOLDIERS BURIED IN AMERICAN CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a list of the deceased soldiers from Massachusetts in the permanent American cemeteries in Europe.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

KEY TO NAMES OF PERMANENT CEMETERIES IN EUROPE

FRANCE

No. 1232—Meuse-Argonne American Cemetery, Romagne-sous-Montfaucon, Meuse.

No. 1764—Aisne-Marne American Cemetery, Belleau, Aisne.

No. 34—Suresnes American Cemetery, Suresnes, Seine.

No. 636—Somme American Cemetery, Bony, Aisne.

No. 608—Oise-Aisne American Cemetery, Seringes-et-Nesles, Aisne.

No. 1235—St. Mihiel American Cemetery, Thiaucourt, Meurthe-et-Moselle.

BELGIUM

No. 1252—Flanders Field American Cemetery, Waereghem, Belgium.

ENGLAND

No. 107—E—Brockwood American Cemetery, near London, England.

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FIRST DIVISION, 16 INFANTRY					
Beck, Henry A.	Pvt. Co. D	1764	23	11	B
Greenwood, Wm. F.	Cpl., Co. D	1764	9	13	B
Kelley, John C.	Pvt. Co. E	1232	32	17	B
Kelley, Michael F.	Pvt. Co. I	608	28	25	A
Lafae, Leo J.	Cpl. Co. D	1232	27	36	C
O'Donnell, Fredk. W.	Cpl. Co. G	608	28	2	D
Sunderland, Samuel	Pvt. Co. H	1232	1	25	E
FIRST DIVISION, 18 INFANTRY					
Shepard, Geo. S.	1 lt. Co. C	636	10	11	C
Meehan, Geo. R.	2 lt. Co. E	1232	34	44	B
Ash, Jos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D	636	8	11	C
Crane, Edward B.	Mech. Co. M	1233	24	19	B
Cranna, John P.	Cpl. Co. F	34	24	17	B
Erickson, Gustaf.	Pvt. Co. E	636	4	7	D
Jalbert, Jules	Pvt. Co. B	1232	21	15	D
Lange, Adelaud	Pvt. Co. K	1232	12	10	F
Martin, Wm. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D	1232	17	42	G
Mercuri, Angelo	Mech. Co. K	34	33	12	B
Nichiporuk, Stefan	Pvt. Co. G	1233	1	5	A
Ryeholm, Gunnar F.	Pvt. Co. D	1232	26	10	B
Smith, Jos. W.	Pvt. Co. C	1232	30	28	A
Smith, Percy A.	Pvt. Co. K	34	13	10	B
FIRST DIVISION, 26 INFANTRY					
Amory, Thos. D.	1 lt. Co. I	1232	34	18	E
Sheridan, Phillip B.	2 lt. Co. L	1232	33	35	B
Bodah, Wm.	Pvt. Co. B	608	1	4	D
Briggs, Ralph S.	Pvt. Co. F	1232	25	13	F
Chaput, Philip A.	Cpl. Co. E	1233	10	24	B
Dougan, Francis E.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1232	22	19	A
Fuller, Andrew A.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1232	12	14	B
Gagnon, Armand A.	Cpl. Co. A	1232	7	6	D
Gavin, John	Pvt. 1 cl., M. G. Co.	1232	39	1	B

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FIRST DIVISION, 26 INFANTRY—continued					
Gittemore, Frank	Pvt. Co. A	1232	22	14	E
Kane, Daniel	Pvt. Co. F	1233	33	24	A
Kwiatkowski, Marcel	Pvt. Co. L	1232	7	25	C
Kyros, Mathew F.	Cpl. Co. E	1232	19	12	A
Menichos, Geo. K.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	35	9	A
Olstein, Edward	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A	1232	22	37	C
O'Neill, Jas.	Pvt. Co. E	1232	21	25	A
Rzeznik, Frank	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B	608	32	5	D
Walsh, Jas. L.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	30	20	H
FIRST DIVISION, 28 INFANTRY					
Haydock, Geo. G.	1 lt. Co. L	636	15	14	C
Buchanan, Max C.	2 lt. Co. D	636	10	12	C
Crawford, John Douglas	2 lt. Co. H	636	16	19	C
Dolan, Edward M.	Sgt. M. G. Co.	608	14	17	D
Green, Clarence E.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D.	1232	13	6	C
Karpik, Adam	Pvt. Co. H	1232	10	43	F
Kennedy, Martin P.	do.	636	4	10	C
Malino, Dominick	Pvt. Co. A	1232	12	29	A
Mathews, Leon R.	Pvt. M. D.	636	8	21	C
McKeon, Jas. J.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	35	25	F
Tobey, Herbert A.	Sgt. Co. F	636	1	11	C
Trombley, Jos. A.	Sgt. M. G. Co.	1232	13	19	C
Walshe, Michael	Pvt. Co. D	1232	12	1	H
Windahl, Bert B.	Pvt. Co. L	608	27	23	C
Woytovich, Romey	Pvt. Co. D	1232	6	23	A
FIRST DIVISION, FIRST MACHINE GUN BATTALION					
Smith, Jas. H.	Pvt. Co. B	1232	1	23	H
FIRST DIVISION, SECOND MACHINE GUN BATTALION					
Achenbach, Max	Pvt. Co. A	1232	6	17	E
Brunt, John J.	Pvt. Co. B	1232	40	35	C
Desrochers, Rodolphe	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C	1232	12	30	B
Hallisey, John I.	Sgt. Co. A	1232	20	45	C
Papanastasion, Stawtis	Pvt. Co. B	1232	40	24	D
Potz, Robt.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	6	44	B
Conolly, Micheal	Pvt. Co. A, 3 M. G. Bn.	1232	35	17	C
O'Neill, Cornelius	Pvt. Co. C, 3 M. G. Bn.	1232	1	39	A
Beal, Howard W.	Maj. M. D., 6 F. A.	34	32	4	B
Warsoski, John F.	Pvt. Bty. C, 6 F. A.	608	5	37	D
Burham, Arthur Ralph	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co., 7 F. A.	1232	14	10	E
Cartland, Wm. H.	Sgt. Bty. B, 7 F. A.	636	10	20	C
Davidson, Harold	Wag. Sup. Co., 7 F. A.	608	3	32	A
Guartha, Chas. J.	Cpl. Bty. E, 7 F. A.	636	4	17	D
Jasset, Ernest L.	Pvt. Bty. B, 7 F. A.	636	9	19	C
Louden, John J.	Pvt. Bty. D, 7 F. A.	636	13	16	C
Quill, John	Pvt. Bty. F, 7 F. A.	1233	33	23	A
Dwight, Lawrence	2 lt. 1 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	34	2	9	B
Batchelder, Raymond H.	Pvt. Co. E, 1 Engrs.	1232	20	24	B
Cormier, Clifford	Pvt. Co. E, 1 Engrs.	1232	21	18	B
Bel Bove, Antonio	Pvt. Co. C, 1 Engrs.	1242	16	33	A
Dollard, Wm. B.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D., 1 Engrs.	608	8	1	D
Hornby, Wm. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 1 Engrs.	636	11	22	D
Perkins, Byron R.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 1 Engrs.	608	26	1	D
Petitpas, Edward C.	Cpl. Co. E, 1 Engrs.	1232	6	27	H
Kittredge, Wm. F.	Pvt. Co. F, 1 Amm. Tn.	1232	34	26	B
Nolan, Lawrence R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 1 Amm. Tn.	1233	2	11	B
SECOND DIVISION, 9 INFANTRY					
Smith, Willard	Capt. Co. I	1233	15	22	B
Neal, Ralph T.	2 lt. Co. L	1232	8	30	E
Phelps, Harold H.	2 lt. Co. C	1232	9	45	B
Adams, Carl C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D	608	6	32	D
Bishop, Wilfred D.	Pvt. Co. B	1232	37	42	D
Breen, Timothy F.	Pvt. Co. E	1764	78	13	A
Buono, Tony	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E	1232	35	24	B
Chartier, David	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F	608	1	32	D
Clough, Harmon	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C	608	20	36	D
Cormier, Peter	Pvt. Co. L	608	34	8	C
Crowley, Thos. H.	Pvt. Co. K	1232	32	24	G
Dansky, Alekex	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E	1764	68	3	B
Dillendiks, Parfen	Pvt. Co. G	608	12	37	D
Donabedian, Kirker S.	Pvt. Co. H	608	1	23	B
Flynn, Geo. M.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1764	63	6	B
Foss, Saxton C.	Pvt. Co. B	1764	18	13	A
Frost, Frank H.	Pvt. Co. F	1764	7	10	B
Gavin, Patrick J.	Cpl. Co. C	1233	29	29	C
Gormley, John R.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	608	3	3	D
Kefalas, Paul D.	Pvt. Co. E	1232	39	22	G
Labrache, Leo W.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	39	4	F
Lacolla, Stephen	Pvt. Co. L	608	6	36	D
McGaffigan, Daniel L.	Pvt. Co. L	1233	27	13	B
McKenney, Chas. O.	Cpl. Co. C	608	18	3	D
McVey, Geo. L.	Pvt. Co. M	1233	15	29	C
O'Hearn, Edward T.	do.	1232	18	27	H
Parmenter, Leslie B.	Cpl. Co. F	1232	1	17	D
Reed, Robt.	Pvt. Co. F	1764	78	8	A
Reenan, Oliver J.	Pvt. Co. M	1232	18	23	A
Steele, Francis C.	Sgt. Co. H	608	29	34	C
Ursolao, Giro	Pvt. Co. G	1764	71	8	B
Wall, Wm. T.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	1764	50	1	B
Wenzlow, Kostante	Sgt. Co. A	1232	27	32	D

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SECOND DIVISION, 9 INFANTRY—con.					
Wile, Lawson A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H	1232	29	3	D
Wyman, Arthur C.	Pvt. Co. C	608	8	9	C
SECOND DIVISION, 23 INFANTRY					
Brown, Fred N.	1 lt. Co. H	1232	15	24	E
Aggelakos, Constantinos	Cpl. Co. K	1232	14	17	H
Alekno, Frank	Pvt. Co. B	1232	6	42	E
Amieten, Stanley	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1232	4	34	E
Armstrong, Arthur S.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	10	24	E
Arsenault, Mammal	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I	1764	111	9	B
Backer, Aleksander	do.	1764	90	7	A
Bradford, Thos.	Sgt. Co. H	1232	20	27	D
Bretton, Jos. J.	Pvt. Co. L	1764	8	2	A
Bruder, Emil	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D	34	5	15	B
Budzak, Stephen A.	Pvt. Co. D	1764	72	9	A
Bullock, John	Pvt. Co. A	1232	22	5	D
Cabana, Merton	Pvt. Co. I	1764	37	1	B
Ceamato, Antonio	do.	1764	72	11	A
Chartier, Louis W.	Pvt. Co. L	1764	17	1	A
Clamore, Wilfred	Pvt. Co. K	1764	45	7	A
Cooper, Daniel F.	Pvt. Co. E	1764	87	10	A
Costello, Edmund N.	Pvt. Co. I	1764	57	2	A
Demodica, Domenica	Pvt. Co. M	1764	15	12	A
Divoeto, Matto	Pvt. Co. E	1232	16	14	D
Donivan, Timothy J.	Wag. Hq. Co.	1764	2	4	B
Ferrier, Alexander	Mech. Co. D	1232	33	33	G
Fielding, Lawrence W.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	28	9	H
Filippello, Dominik	Pvt. Co. M	1764	64	4	A
Gilberti, Amedeo	Pvt. Co. K	1764	7	3	A
Girouard, Jos.	Pvt. Co. D	1232	28	38	H
Grayson, Jas. W.	Pvt. Co. M	1764	34	11	A
Greenlaw, Walter L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H	1232	8	24	E
Healey, Richard	Pvt. Co. L	1764	44	10	B
Holloway, Bernard C.	Pvt. Co. E	608	10	5	D
Iannetta, Euginio	Pvt. Co. G	608	28	32	D
Johnston, Frank R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C	1232	37	26	A
Johnston, Albert L.	Mech. Co. H	608	7	17	B
King, Jas. A.	Pvt. Co. M	1764	21	7	B
Koch, Brune	Pvt. Co. K	1764	58	6	A
Korecz, Peter H.	Pvt. M. D.	1764	65	3	B
LaJeunesse, Eugene A.	Pvt. Co. H	1764	10	3	A
Lawson, John F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1764	72	13	A
Lindquist, Carl	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co.	1233	11	3	D
Lozzi, Antonio	Pvt. Co. M	34	8	11	B
Lucchesi, Mario	do.	1764	60	7	A
Luke, Stanley H.	Bglr. Co. G	1232	12	34	G
Lynch, Andrew	Pvt. Co. M	34	15	11	B
Majolis, Jos.	Pvt. Co. H	608	15	41	D
Manning, Jas. P.	Pvt. Co. L	608	3	22	C
Mansfield, Gordon W.	Cpl. Co. I	1764	90	3	A
McNamara, Ernest R.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	39	36	F
Nee, Michael J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G	608	19	37	B
Novello, Lorenzo	Pvt. Co. H	608	14	13	D
O'Brien, Martin R.	Pvt. Co. M	1764	41	9	A
Paradine, Patrick	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A	1764	19	2	A
Patti, Domenico	do.	1764	8	3	A
Roehin, Jek	Pvt. Co. M	1764	73	1	A
Rogers, Thos. J.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	33	38	F
Russell, Ernest	Pvt. Co. M	1764	56	12	A
Russell, Thos. L.	Pvt. Co. E	1764	6	2	A
Russo, Jos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1764	49	4	A
Scimone, Laborio	Pvt. Co. F	608	7	34	A
Stoddard, Jos. M.	Pvt. Co. K	1764	29	9	A
Taylor, Jos. W.	Pvt. Co. H	608	30	35	D
Tenbroeck, Edward A.	Sgt. Co. K	1764	17	6	B
Turcotte, Geo. L.	Pvt. Co. L	1764	39	11	A
Valcourt, Lee P.	Pvt. Co. K	1764	79	6	A
Beillette, Jos. A.	Pvt. Co. M	1764	27	9	A
Verdowkas, Geo.	Pvt. Co. C	1764	81	12	A
Viola, Jas.	Pvt. Co. G	1233	5	6	A
Walendziak, Walter	Pvt. Co. H	1232	28	24	G
Zona, Orcaio	Pvt. Co. M	34	30	9	B
Zuma, Sebastian	do.	1232	34	31	B
FIFTH REGIMENT, U. S. MARINE CORPS					
Wass, Lester S.	Capt. 15 Co.	608	12	16	D
Ashley, Thos. W.	2 lt. 67 Co.	1764	63	6	A
Vose, Howard Lewis	2 lt. 55 Co.	1764	17	13	A
Wahlstrom, Fredk	2 lt. Hq. Co.	1232	32	38	B
Bock, Fred Eugene	Pvt. 51 Co.	1764	76	7	A
Bradbury, Eben, jr.	Pvt. 55 Co.	1764	84	7	A
Cannon, Rollin Mariner	Pvt. 18 Co.	1764	45	9	B
Cooke, Ralph	Pvt. 16 Co.	34	31	15	B
Fasano, Jos.	Pvt. 43 Co.	1764	51	3	A
Ferranti, Ernest Jos.	Pvt. 51 Co.	1764	38	5	A
Fraser, Gilbert Duncan	Pvt. 18 Co.	1764	58	10	A
Johnson, Paul T.	do.	1232	13	39	E
Joy, John Jos.	Pvt. 51 Co.	1232	20	44	C
Kimball, Richard	Pvt. 16 Co.	1764	27	2	B
Morgan, Jas. D.	Pvt. 51 Co.	538	35	15	C
Morse, Clyde Webber	Col. Hq. Co.	1232	15	35	H
Paine, Herbert Adams	Sgt. Hq. Co.	1232	2	28	D
Rourke, Arthur Jos.	Pvt. 8 Co.	1232	2	38	D
Stinson, Daniel C.	Pvt. 17 Co.	1764	45	2	A
Toomey, Robt. J.	Pvt. 49 Co.	1764	9	2	B
Wilson, Herman C.	Gy. Sgt. 49 Co.	1764	22	7	A

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SIXTH REGIMENT, U. S. MARINE CORPS					
Burr, Carleton	2 lt. 74 Co.	1764	76	2	A
Bassani, John A.	Cpl. 74 Co.	1764	11	4	B
Brough, Frank C.	Pvt. 82 Co.	1764	17	8	A
Greenspan, Harry	Pvt. 79 Co.	1233	31	2	D
Love, John D.	Sgt. 79 Co.	1232	11	22	H
MacDonald, Hugh Alex.	Sgt. 97 Co.	608	34	22	C
Noonan, Wm. John	Pvt. 75 Co.	1232	38	41	H
Parker, Donald M.	Cpl. 80 Co.	1233	20	2	B
Sullivan, Daniel A.	Pvt. 82 Co.	1764	45	6	A
Taylor, Geo. Russell	Pvt. 95 Co.	1764	5	2	B
Veno, Geo. Jas. R.	Pvt. 95 Co.	1764	52	2	B
Warren, Samuel	Pvt. 76 Co.	1233	2	14	B
Woodman, Dexter E.	Pvt. 96 Co.	1232	35	28	E
McBeth, Chas.	Pvt. Co. B, 4 N. G. Bn.	1233	1	29	D
Bartley, Jas. J.	Cpl. Co. A, 5 M. G. Bn.	1232	30	32	B
Harkins, John E.	Pvt. Co. D, 5 M. G. Bn.	1232	40	43	A
Manning, Frank W.	do.	1764	31	9	A
Minahan, Chas. W.	do.	608	2	15	A
Regan, Jos. H.	Pvt. Co. C, 5 M. G. Bn.	1764	15	2	A
Tidd, Jos. H.	Pvt. Co. A, 5 M. G. Bn.	1232	17	6	F
Cole, Edward Ball	Maj. Hq. Co., 6 M. G. Bn.	1764	37	3	B
Donahue, Daniel Edw.	Sgt. 81 Co., 6 M. G. Bn.	1764	67	7	B
Dompier, Francis W.	Pvt. Bty. F, 12 F. A.	1764	6	7	A
Dube, Wm.	Pvt. Bty. D, 12 F. A.	1764	18	12	A
Hubble, Fredk.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C, 12 F. A.	608	29	8	D
Bitgood, Chas. E.	Pvt. Bty. B, 15 F. A.	1232	22	41	E
Cumiskey, Henry T.	Pvt. Bty. E, 15 F. A.	1764	68	4	B
Barbarino, John	Pvt. Co. D, 2 Engrs.	1764	49	9	A
Keefe, Harold S.	Pvt. 1 Amb. Co. 2 San. Tn.	1232	35	44	A
THIRD DIVISION					
Ball, Robt E.	1st lt. Co. B, 4 Inf.	1764	49	4	B
Bocella, Nicholas	Pvt. Co. F, 4 Inf.	1232	2	32	C
Bukoski, Frank	Sgt. Co. H, 4 Inf.	608	31	36	A
Carroll, Edward J.	Pvt. Co. A, 4 Inf.	1232	7	17	A
Lynch, Geo. L.	Pvt. Co. M, 4 Inf.	1232	16	45	B
McDonough, John E.	Cpl. Co. B, 4 Inf.	1232	7	3	A
Kellogg, Branton H.	Capt. Co. H, 7 Inf.	1232	3	37	C
Baranowski, Stanley	Pvt. Co. L, 7 Inf.	608	25	16	A
MacElligott, Geo. Henry	1 lt. M. G. Co. 30 Inf.	608	28	8	A
Archer, John	Pvt. Co. L, 30 Inf.	1232	30	39	G
Beninato, Salvatore	Pvt. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1232	17	23	E
Briggs, Chas. F.	Pvt. Co. G, 30 Inf.	1232	58	1	B
Finn, Thos. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 30 Inf.	1232	29	32	A
Hagan, Peter A.	Pvt. Co. M, 30 Inf.	1232	33	5	E
Matton, Jos.	Pvt. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1764	63	5	A
Poliski, John	Pvt. Co. G, 30 Inf.	1232	8	6	D
Pottier, Arthur C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 30 Inf.	608	24	1	B
Reilly, John L.	Pvt. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1764	69	7	A
Santos, Gil	Cpl. Co. C, 30 Inf.	608	37	10	B
Vautrain, Levi J.	Pvt. Co. K, 30 Inf.	1233	19	14	A
Young, Henry A.	Pvt. Co. A, 30 Inf.	608	32	8	A
Young, Richmond	1 lt. Co. K, 38 Inf.	1232	12	16	A
Crean, Jeremiah F.	Cpl. Co. A, 38 Inf.	608	26	2	A
Emmel, Gustav	Mech. Co. K, 38 Inf.	1232	12	18	E
Greene, Geo. F.	Cpl. Co. H, 38 Inf.	1232	18	15	C
Kehoe, Ernest G.	Mech. Hq. Co. 38 Inf.	1764	65	10	B
Korjeki, Frank	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 38 Inf.	608	34	13	B
Saki, Jan	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 38 Inf.	608	24	25	A
Secor, Lionel L.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D. 38 Inf.	1232	30	45	A
Taylor, Thos. H.	Pvt. Co. K, 38 Inf.	1232	6	2	H
Weinstein, Geo.	Pvt. Co. C, 38 Inf.	608	22	26	A
Weis, John F.	Cpl. Co. E, 38 Inf.	1232	9	10	A
Yanchuk, Audrey	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 38 Inf.	608	1	14	B
Healy, Harold A.	2 lt. Co. D, 8 M. G. Bn.	1232	32	41	A
Holmes, Geo. W.	Sgt. Co. D, 8 M. G. Bn.	1233	11	8	B
McGillen, Geo. F.	2 lt. Co. A, 9 M. G. Bn.	608	31	9	B
Dixon, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 9 M. G. Bn.	1232	36	15	D
Duffy, Wm. P.	Pvt. Co. C, 9 M. G. Bn.	1764	67	11	B
Gibeault, Arthur	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 9 M. G. Bn.	608	27	25	B
Hebert, Jos. A.	Cpl. Co. D, 9 M. G. Bn.	34	16	11	B
Desmond, Walter P.	1 lt. M. D. 18 F. A.	1232	7	44	D
Cook, Edward Everitt	Pvt. Bty. E, 76 F. A.	608	32	21	A
Dugan, John Francis	Cpl. Hq. Co. 76 F. A.	1233	31	11	A
Goodwin, Victor F.	Pvt. Bty. D, 76 F. A.	1232	26	20	B
Phoe, Jordan E.	Cpl. Bty. D, 76 F. A.	608	12	20	A
Saudinger, Edgar L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D, 76 F. A.	1232	35	35	E
Cuoco, Michele	Pvt. 3 Trn. Mtr. Bty.	608	37	26	A
Aliem, Ralph H.	Cpl. Co. B, 6 Engrs.	1232	32	17	G
Barnie, Jas. M.	Pvt. Co. A, 6 Engrs.	1232	20	34	E
Bourget, Geo. A.	do.	1232	31	19	B
Cooper, Hubert P.	do.	608	36	23	A
Coyne, Jos. H.	Pvt. Co. F, 6 Engrs.	636	2	13	C
Curtis, Harry L.	Cpl. Co. B, 6 Engrs.	636	11	17	A
Danphinas, Harry	Pvt. Co. A, 6 Engrs.	1764	49	7	B
Faulkner, Edward M.	Pvt. Co. C, 6 Engrs.	1233	17	19	B
Fournier, Jos. T.	do.	608	30	20	A
Hanlon, Francis S.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D., 6 Engrs.	608	16	3	B
Monteith, Wm. A. R.	Pvt. Co. A, 6 Engrs.	608	32	24	A
Pyrah, Clarence F.	Pvt. Co. D, 6 Engrs.	636	4	19	D
Wood, Albert T.	Sgt. 1 cl. Co. M, 6 Engrs.	1232	40	34	G
Lewis, Morse	Sgt. Co. E, 3 Sup. Tn.	1232	8	2	H
Riley, Wm. A.	Pvt. Co. G, 3 Amm. Tn.	1232	40	20	G
FOURTH DIVISION					
Brown, Jos. C.	Cpl. Co. E, 39 Inf.	608	10	6	C
Conty, Jas.	Pv. Co. C, 39 Inf.	1232	25	24	H
Fedoruk, Philip	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 39 Inf.	1232	8	31	E
Garnett, Walter E.	Sgt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	608	32	1	B
Goddard, Ralph J.	Bgr. Co. M, 39 Inf.	1232	1	15	E
Hogan, Chas. R.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 39 Inf.	1232	21	32	H

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FOURTH DIVISION—con.					
Magrane, Francis J.	Cpl. Co. L, 39 Inf.	1232	21	41	H
Morrison, Jas. M.	Pvt. Co. F, 39 Inf.	34	8	16	B
Murray, Jos. H.	Cpl. Co. L, 39 Inf.	608	13	1	C
O'Connell, Philip J.	Pvt. 1 cl. MD 39 Inf.	608	30	13	B
Patete, Alesandro	Pvt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	1764	15	7	A
Priezeff, Josema	Cpl. Co. F, 39 Inf.	608	2	7	C
Russo, John	Pvt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	1232	35	15	F
Shannon, Geo. M.	Cpl. Co. H, 39 Inf.	608	32	23	C
Whelan, Thos. L.	Sgt. Co. C, 39 Inf.	1764	45	4	B
Williams, Wm.	Pvt. Co. I, 39 Inf.	1232	13	13	F
Tetley, Egbert F.	2 lt. Co. C, 47 Inf.	608	15	28	C
Burdett, Ralph M.	Pvt. Co. C, 47 Inf.	1232	31	29	D
Cooper, Louis	Pvt. Co. D, 47 Inf.	1232	9	34	H
Fairbrother, Jesse	Pvt. 1 cl. MD 47 Inf.	608	20	2	C
Holland, John Francis	Cpl. Co. B, 47 Inf.	608	14	10	B
LaPlante, Wm. G.	Cpl. Co. G, 47 Inf.	1232	19	4	A
Millsted, Arthur	Pvt. Co. K, 47 Inf.	34	20	4	A
Morandi, Karl A.	Pvt. Co. C, 47 Inf.	608	23	6	D
Rizos, Wm.	Cpl. Co. A, 47 Inf.	608	14	6	A
Teixeira, Antonio P.	Pvt. Co. A, 47 Inf.	1232	9	25	E
Weeks, Albert S.	Cpl. Hq. Co. 47 Inf.	608	21	14	B
Welton, Edmund J.	Sgt. Co. C, 47 Inf.	608	15	7	B
Wood, Wm. W.	Sup. Sgt. Co. K, 47 Inf.	1764	17	11	A
Atwood, Fredk. M.	2 lt. Sup. Co. 58 Inf.	608	11	24	D
Andruszewicz, Antoni	Pvt. Co. L, 58 Inf.	1232	8	20	A
Andrych, Stanislaw	Pvt. Co. D, 58 Inf.	603	27	4	C
Brychewicz, Brunon	Pvt. Co. B, 58 Inf.	1232	29	17	A
Borovik, Fedor	Pvt. Co. L, 58 Inf.	1232	11	25	A
Capobianco, Raphaelo	Pvt. Co. E, 58 Inf.	1232	13	6	F
Conacigris, Nicholas	Pvt. Co. L, 58 Inf.	1232	14	23	D
Coppola, Ralph	Pvt. Co. D, 58 Inf.	1764	78	7	A
Cumiskey, Jas. F.	Cpl. Co. H, 58 Inf.	1233	8	10	A
Draper, John	Pvt. Co. A, 58 Inf.	1232	2	29	A
Felix, Ralph L.	Pvt. Co. C, 58 Inf.	1232	20	44	B
Felter, Adam	Pvt. Co. D, 58 Inf.	1764	78	6	A
Fine, Abraham	do.	608	16	17	A
Fortin, Jos. P.	Pvt. Co. I, 58 Inf.	1232	28	31	D
Fountain, Paul F.	Pvt. Co. C, 58 Inf.	1232	30	40	F
McCakshy, Lawrence F.	Pvt. Co. B, 58 Inf.	1232	40	34	E
Pasolini, Leopoldo	Pvt. Co. F, 58 Inf.	1232	7	7	F
Wagstaff, Harold C.	1 lt. M. G. Co. 59 Inf.	1764	13	2	A
Berry, Clarence L.	Pvt. Co. I, 59 Inf.	1764	18	3	A
Christian, Steve E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 59 Inf.	1764	74	9	A
Cunningham, Thos. A.	Pvt. Co. D, 59 Inf.	1764	2	9	B
Devaney, Henry J.	Pvt. Co. L, 59 Inf.	1232	4	11	H
Dusswicz, John	Pvt. Co. F, 59 Inf.	1232	35	14	H
Garinagian, Shahin	Pvt. Co. M, 59 Inf.	1232	19	13	D
Geoffrion, Dona	Pvt. Co. E, 59 Inf.	1232	34	41	D
Gokey, Arthur	do.	1232	35	35	A
Harlow, Carleton T.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 59 Inf.	608	19	34	D
Harlow, Jas. Robt.	Pvt. Co. F, 59 Inf.	1232	21	7	F
Howes, Ralph G.	Pvt. Co. C, 59 Inf.	1233	11	18	C
Hurley, Vincent P.	Pvt. Co. E, 59 Inf.	608	4	11	D
Kehoe, Michael	do.	1232	16	29	F
MacDonald, Wm. C.	Pvt. Co. H, 59 Inf.	1232	25	7	F
Marchi, Cesare A.	do.	1764	28	4	A
Menengas, Manvel S.	Pvt. Co. L, 59 Inf.	1764	6	9	B
Nickerson, Josiah D.	do.	1764	12	11	A
Palamountain, Paul B.	do.	1232	1	21	E
Silvia, John	Pvt. Co. E, 59 Inf.	1232	3	38	C
Swift, Stanley C.	Pvt. Co. D, 59 Inf.	1232	23	24	E
Theodore, Christos	Pvt. Co. C, 59 Inf.	1232	8	25	E
Tiberii, John	Pvt. Co. M, 59 Inf.	1232	34	27	E
Wispalis, Jos.	Pvt. Co. B, 59 Inf.	1232	39	30	E
Gleason, Carl B.	Pvt. MD, 11 M. G. Bn.	1232	31	17	G
Murphy, Harry E.	Pvt. Co. B, 11 M. G. Bn.	1232	21	33	E
Williams, Ralph E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 11 M. G. Bn.	1764	23	13	B
Fretz, Earl R.	1 lt. Co. B, 12 M. G. Bn.	1764	16	10	B
Gallagher, Wm.	Pvt. Co. C, 12 M. G. Bn.	1232	14	31	D
Brouen, Axel G.	Pvt. Bty. D, 13 F. A.	1232	6	6	A
Furtado, Henry P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C, 13 F. A.	608	4	24	D
Healy, Jas. F.	Sgt. Bty. B, 16 F. A.	1232	20	14	C
Morris, Jas.	Mech. Bty. F, 16 F. A.	608	1	6	C
McCartin, John P.	Pvt. Co. D, 4 Engrs.	1233	19	26	C
Oppenheim, Aaron J.	Sgt. Co. G, 4 Amm. Tn.	1233	24	24	A
FIFTH DIVISION					
Burns, Chas. H.	1 lt. Co. I, 6 Inf.	1232	39	43	C
Alves, Andrew P.	Cpl. Co. M, 6 Inf.	1233	25	16	D
Driscoll, Wm. E.	Sgt. M. G. Co. 6 Inf.	1232	26	22	H
Morris, Fredk.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 6 Inf.	1232	28	26	D
Phillips, Arthur	Pvt. Co. E, 6 Inf.	1232	21	27	F
Shanse, Jos. J.	Cpl. M. G. Co. 6 Inf.	1232	35	21	F
Tolkun, John	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 6 Inf.	1232	30	41	A
Blanchette, Adolph	Pvt. 1 cl. Sup. Co., 11 Inf.	1233	25	26	D
Destefano, Luigi	Pvt. Co. A, 11 Inf.	1232	4	46	B
Dose, Fredk. Chas.	Capt. Hq. Co., 60 Inf.	608	21	7	A
Martell, Judson Gordon	1 lt. Co. E, 60 Inf.	1232	25	24	A
Amerena, Wm.	Pvt. Co. G, 60 Inf.	1232	22	31	G
Binette, Wildred L.	Pvt. Co. H, 60 Inf.	1232	7	7	A
Bronski, Daniel	Pvt. Co. D, 60 Inf.	1233	13	27	C
D'Onofrio, Alessandro	Pvt. Co. E, 60 Inf.	1233	31	7	B
Dunn, Patrick J.	do.	1232	2	5	D
Gallant, Henry	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 60 Inf.	1232	10	6	A
Gleason, Martin M.	Pvt. Co. C, 60 Inf.	1232	38	24	E
Harrington, Bernard	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 60 Inf.	1232	3	24	A
Kussmaul, Fredk. A.	Pvt. Co. D, 60 Inf.	1232	10	5	C
MacPherson, Leslie	Cpl. Hq. Co. 60 Inf.	1232	30	41	G
Maroney, Edward F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 60 Inf.	1233	23	6	A
McCaffrey, Thos.	Pvt. Co. A, 60 Inf.	1233	7	29	O
McCulloch, Archie, jr.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 60 Inf.	1232	15	16	H
Moreau, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 60 Inf.	1232	8	43	F

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
FIFTH DIVISION—CON.					
Raymond, Carlton E.	Pvt. Sup. Co., 60 Inf.	1233	6	25	D
Sarzen, Cornelius	Pvt. Co. E, 60 Inf.	1232	7	14	A
Stone, Byron E.	Pvt. Co. I, 60 Inf.	1232	23	16	F
Wheeler, Warren F.	Pvt. Co. G, 60 Inf.	1232	22	5	F
Coupe, Norman	Pvt. Co. E, 61 Inf.	1232	21	30	E
Dean, John W.	Pvt. Co. H, 61 Inf.	1232	23	15	B
McCauley, Thos. G.	Cpl. Co. M, 61 Inf.	1232	2	19	B
Michele, Giuseppe	Pvt. Co. K, 61 Inf.	1232	35	21	B
Reveney, John W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 61 Inf.	1232	34	34	G
Rosa, Louis J.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 61 Inf.	1232	10	17	G
Rose, Louis	Sgt. Co. K, 61 Inf.	1232	24	22	G
Smith, Oscar	Wag. Co. E, 61 Inf.	1232	31	14	B
Valleriani, Jas. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 61 Inf.	1232	2	6	E
Joyce, Patrick W.	Pvt. Co. A, 13 M. G. Bn.	1233	32	22	E
Frostholm, Jens H.	2 lt. Co. A, 14 M. G. Bn.	1232	7	22	B
Birtz, Louis	Pvt. Bty. A, 15 F. A.	1232	11	18	H
Protono, Frank	Sadr. Sup. Co., 19 F. A.	1233	30	23	B
Laventure, Louis H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Fld. Hosp. 30	1233	28	26	D
SIXTH DIVISION					
Murphy, Harold S.	Cpl. Co. C, 52 Inf.	1232	18	16	F
Lamont, John	Pvt. Bty. A, 3 F. A.	1232	8	6	B
Byrne, John E.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 11 F. A.	1232	11	4	B
Ward, Albert V.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E, 11 F. A.	1232	34	10	H
Hayes, John E.	Pvt. Sup. Co., 78 F. A.	1232	15	14	D
Anderson, Ralph	Pvt. 1 cl. Ord. Det., 6 Am. Tn.	1232	13	12	D
Max, Charlie	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 6 Am. Tn.	1232	20	10	C
SEVENTH DIVISION					
Thornton, John J.	Cpl. Co. D, 34 Inf.	1233	24	4	B
Castagnoli, Battista	Pvt. M. G. Co., 55 Inf.	1233	7	8	C
O'Keefe, Garrett I.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 79 F. A.	1233	28	23	B
Seegell, Harry H.	Pvt. Bty. E, 8 F. A.	1233	29	22	C
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 101 INFANTRY					
Hayes, Robt.	Capt. 3d Bn.	1232	29	7	B
Kittredge, Paul E.	Capt. Co. F	1232	14	44	A
Bascom, Edgar D.	2 lt. Co. B	1232	15	40	B
Plenniken, John	2 lt. Co. M	1232	31	17	B
Abbott, Leon E.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1764	70	13	A
Abrahams, Thos.	Pvt. Co. A	1233	18	7	B
Attarian, Harry	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I	1233	23	19	C
Bangs, Louis S.	Cpl. Co. B	608	20	3	A
Benner, Wm. B.	Pvt. Co. L	1764	66	9	B
Bowes, Jas. A.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	1	33	C
Bradley, Harold V.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	2	6	C
Bruce, Jas. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K	1232	15	4	C
Bruce, Walter	Pvt. Co. M	1233	4	9	C
Bryson, Raymond G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C	1232	37	33	E
Buck, David R.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1764	75	6	A
Burns, Arthur W.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	16	13	B
Burns, John Jos.	Cpl. Co. L	1232	52	25	E
Burns, Lawrence J.	Pvt. Co. L	608	29	21	D
Canary, Wm. E.	Cpl. Co. D	1233	6	25	D
Carey, Fredk. J.	Pvt. Co. D	1232	32	40	G
Carley, Edward E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C	1232	21	42	F
Carraher, Ernest J.	Sgt. Hq. Co.	1232	29	15	H
Cavanagh, Chas. H.	Wag. Sup. Co.	608	32	11	B
Chalfour, Philip	Pvt. Co. M	1764	74	1	A
Christie, David B.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G	1764	16	12	A
Clabby, John L.	Sgt. Co. F	1233	9	15	D
Coffey, Francis W.	Pvt. Co. E	1232	19	20	E
Collette, Raymond J.	Pvt. Co. F	1232	6	4	H
Connolly, Jas.	Pvt. Co. K	1232	31	10	D
Crowley, John J.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	608	37	21	B
Curran, Patrick	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1764	55	7	B
Daly, Wm. J.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	1764	3	1	B
Dame, Henry W.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	33	19	F
David, George	Pvt. Co. H	1233	36	4	A
DeRusha, Henry W.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co.	1764	33	4	A
Devlin, Edward F.	Cpl. Co. F	1232	9	7	B
Douglas, Ralph W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K	1233	34	13	D
Downing, Albert H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H	1764	11	5	B
Drisko, Ralph R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A	1232	36	37	C
Dunbar, Jos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H	1233	29	5	B
Durkee, Sidney H.	Pvt. Co. D	1233	7	23	B
Emmons, Fredk. D.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	16	14	D
Fay, Jas. A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A	1232	18	31	B
Fitzgerald, Martin R.	Cook Hq. Co.	1232	31	44	C
Fitz-Henry, Lewis F.	1st Sgt. Co. C	34	12	19	A
Foley, Walter J.	Pvt. Co. I	1232	33	33	A
Foster, Lawrence W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1232	40	22	D
Furlong, Francis L.	Cpl. Co. H	1233	21	15	D
Gavain, Thos. M.	Pvt. Co. I	1232	33	27	F
Glass, John F., Jr.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D	1232	8	11	G
Grady, John J.	Sgt. Co. L	1232	15	12	D
Grant, Alexander B.	Pvt. Co. E	1232	22	40	E
Greenleaf, Wm. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B	1232	2	3	B
Hagen, Lawrence M. G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1233	33	2	A
Hanrahan, Daniel J.	Cpl. Co. A	1232	28	11	E
Harris, Wm. L.	Cpl. Co. E	1233	5	15	D
Heneghan, Patrick J.	Sgt. Co. D	608	7	32	B
Higby, Ivan V.	Cpl. Co. A	1232	24	5	G
Johnson, Wilfred B.	Sgt. Co. I	1764	39	4	B
Karem, Thos.	Pvt. Co. C	1233	29	14	D
Kelly, Wm. C.	Cpl. M. G. Co.	1232	15	36	F
Kennedy, Jas.	Pvt. Co. I	1232	1	15	H
Kennedy, Thos. F.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	34	10	12	A
Knudsen, Sverre	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1764	30	6	A
Koreb, Martin G.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	20	36	A

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 101 INFANTRY—CON.					
Kramer, Harry	Pvt. Co. H	1233	6	20	B
Kurth, Wm.	Pvt. Co. B	1233	18	24	D
Lancaster, Guy L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I	1232	9	28	E
Lancot, Napoleon J.	Pvt. Co. M	1233	2	17	C
Leahy, Thos. A.	Pvt. Co. E	1764	15	10	B
Lindsay, John F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I	1233	5	1	D
Little, Arthur H.	Pvt. Co. A	1232	9	34	A
Lowery, Winthrop S.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	28	38	B
Lyons, Frank	Pvt. Co. M	1764	50	5	A
Lyons, Herbert A.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1232	12	35	G
MacDonald, John R.	Mech. Co. L	1233	18	19	C
MacKenzie, Kenneth A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G	1232	20	27	A
MacLean, Roderick A. J.	Pvt. Co. C	1233	1	27	D
Mahoney, Jas. F.	Sgt. Co. E	1233	29	26	D
Manning, John J.	Cpl. Co. C	1233	8	8	C
Marien, Henry C.	Sgt. Co. M	1232	40	32	H
Mayne, John	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D.	608	15	19	A
McBride, John J.	Cpl. Co. A	1232	39	32	H
McCarthy, Dennis D.	Cpl. Co. E	1232	15	18	F
McDonald, John H.	Pvt. Co. E	1233	20	26	E
McGarr, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G	1232	20	35	E
McGrath, Jas. J.	Cpl. Co. L	1233	25	4	B
McGuire, Bernard J.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	1232	12	14	A
McIntosh, Allan	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D.	1232	18	39	F
McIver, Gavin R.	Cpl. Co. A	608	9	19	A
McKenna, Jas. M.	do.	1764	12	4	A
McKeon, Geo. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A	1233	14	8	D
Mealy, Geo. H.	Sgt. Co. K	1764	58	4	A
Meehan, John R.	Sgt. Hq. Co.	1764	52	13	B
Morey, Ralph E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E	1232	11	20	F
Mullaney, Thos. J.	Pvt. Co. C	1232	21	21	F
Murphy, John W.	do.	1233	5	13	B
Murray, Robt. A., Jr.	Pvt. Co. K	1233	3	1	D
Myers, Chas. S.	do.	1764	21	4	A
Nelson, Edward A.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	24	12	C
Nickerson, Simeon L.	Sgt. Co. D	608	10	19	A
Noonan, Arthur J.	Pvt. Co. H	1232	17	46	O
O'Donoghue, Michael F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co.	1232	23	27	A
O'Keefe, Wm. S.	Pvt. M. D.	1233	17	13	C
Paglia, Vincenzo	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L	1232	13	27	A
Parnell, Bert J.	Pvt. Co. A	1233	21	21	C
Piggott, Garrett	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E	1764	52	8	B
Piso, Rocco	Pvt. Co. A	1232	21	11	F
Ray, Matthew R.	Cpl. Co. D	1232	10	33	E
Richardson, George L.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co.	1232	25	27	E
Riley, Chas. R.	Cpl. Co. E	1233	7	15	C
Rotch, Lester J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I	1232	7	45	C
Rutledge, Stephen F.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1232	15	41	A
Ryan, Thos. A.	Cpl. Co. D	608	11	19	A
Salner, Morris	Pvt. Co. M	1233	7	23	C
Sampson, Harry	Cpl. Co. E	1232	28	8	D
Shea, Francis A.	Pvt. Co. A	1233	13	19	A
Smith, Albert C.	do.	608	17	19	A
Smith, Henry F.	Pvt. Co. B	1764	12	1	B
Solari, Arthur J.	Pvt. Co. D	1232	7	37	D
Sullivan, Chas. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G	1764	30	12	A
Sweeney, John	Pvt. Co. F	1233	32	23	C
Sweeney, Matthew J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E	1764	63	10	B
Sykes, Edgar W.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	1232	2	38	C
Thomson, Albert	Pvt. Co. I	1764	66	5	A
Tierney, Jas. J.	Cpl. Co. C	1233	32	4	B
Tryder, Wm. J.	Sgt. Co. H	1232	21	19	E
Tully, Daniel F.	Cpl. Co. F	1232	29	38	G
Warren, John M.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	34	17	1	B
Wheaton, Homer J.	Cpl. Co. G	608	34	12	B
Wilson, Clifford H.	Pvt. Co. F	608	38	21	B
Yelle, Adrian L.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	14	13	C
Yeomans, Fredk. J.	Pvt. Co. L	1232	4	25	H
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Oliva, Felix M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Tp.	1233	27	24	C
Linton, Fredk. M.	1 lt. Hq. Co., 51 Inf. Brig.	1233	14	9	D
Corbett, Wm. B.	2 lt. Co. L, 102 Inf.	1232	29	36	B
Carey, Jas. O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 102 Inf.	1233	14	23	B
Depatie, Romeo	Pvt. Co. I, 102 Inf.	1764	46	5	B
Flibbert, Henry	Pvt. Co. K, 102 Inf.	1232	1	4	G
Gallant, Jos.	Pvt. Co. L, 102 Inf.	1764	23	3	A
Gierman, Arthur	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 102 Inf.	1232	2	16	D
Joyce, Warren H.	do.	1232	23	24	D
Martin, Roy B.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co., 102 Inf.	1233	19	24	C
McKeon, Geo. J.	Pvt. Co. M, 102 Inf.	1764	64	6	A
Meuse, Thos. E.	Pvt. Co. F, 102 Inf.	34	40	5	B
Mitchell, Lester	Pvt. Co. L, 102 Inf.	1233	18	18	C
Parquette, Jector	Pvt. Co. F, 102 Inf.	608	23	21	A
Allen, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. H, 103 Inf.	1232	13	42	D
Cappello, Angelo	Pvt. Co. G, 103 Inf.	608	4	8	D
Bvowczek, Francisek	Pvt. Co. G, 102 Inf.	1233	28	28	C
Cennor, Eugene M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 103 Inf.	1233	9	4	B
Dalrymple, Thos. P.	Cpl. Co. A, 103 Inf.	1232	22	10	C
Danforth, Geo. C.	Pvt. Co. D, 103 Inf.	1764	40	8	A
Johnson, Wm. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 103 Inf.	1764	14	2	B
Hunt, Hugh I.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 103 Inf.	608	14	4	D
McGovern, Philip W.	Pvt. Co. B, 103 Inf.	1764	80	8	A
Morrison, Daniel	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 103 Inf.	1764	76	10	A
O'Callaghan, Thos. J. A.	Cpl. Co. B, 103 Inf.	1764	5	12	A
Smart, Peter H.	Pvt. Co. K, 103 Inf.	1232	35	25	A
Tyler, Harry V.	Pvt. Co. C, 103 Inf.	1764	8	12	A
Vaudreuil, Arthur P.	Pvt. Co. L, 103 Inf.	608	33	5	D
Walsh, Edward	Cpl. Co. K, 103 Inf.	608	20	27	D

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 104 INFANTRY					
Phillips, Edward H.	Capt. Co. E.	(1)			
Welles, Halleck, jr.	Capt. Co. F.	34	29	4	B
Blanchard, Hugh C.	1 lt. Co. L.	1764	52	2	A
Madison, Burdette Rockleff.	1 lt. M.G. Co.	34	29	6	B
Brigham, Wm. N., jr.	2 lt. Co. D.	608	17	12	A
Ewing, John A.	2 lt. Co. I.	1233	23	9	C
Akroyd, Hebert F.	Pvt. Co. G.	1233	32	24	C
Albeski, Felix.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	1764	46	11	A
Alsen, Carl H.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	2	12	C
Anderson, Alfred F.	Musn. 3cl. Hq. Co.	1233	24	26	D
Andrews, Floyd H.	Cpl. Co. A.	1232	36	29	H
Armitage, Wilfred T.	Pvt. Co. F.	608	2	1	B
Baribault, Leon A.	Cpl. Co. B.	1233	1	26	D
Beaulieu, Paul.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B.	34	23	8	B
Bedard, Gilbert.	Pvt. Co. D.	1233	17	26	D
Belliveau, Alfred J.	Pvt. Co. E.	1232	39	8	F
Bellows, Chas. A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	608	8	1	A
Bennett, Herbert W.	Bgr. Co. L.	1232	36	34	G
Billings, Henry W.	Pvt. Co. A.	1232	40	27	C
Croteau, Louis M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	1233	9	9	C
Cummings, Timothy B.	Pvt. Co. A.	1233	4	19	C
Dalton, Leonard L.	Pvt. Co. L.	1233	12	12	C
De Roy, Narcisse A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1764	48	1	A
Donegan, John P.	Pvt. Co. A.	1232	27	24	A
Doucette, Howard F.	Pvt. Co. E.	1764	66	2	A
Doucette, Jas. E.	Pvt. Sup. Co.	608	4	37	B
Duquette, Edward.	Pvt. Co. A.	1764	8	1	A
Ehlert, Henry.	Cook Hq. Co.	608	19	32	A
Emery, Victor A.	Cpl. Co. E.	1232	21	44	D
Fagan, Wilfred J.	Cpl. Co. D.	1232	3	34	H
Finem, Jos. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	608	14	19	A
Fitzgerald, Howard P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1233	15	26	C
Forget, Wm. J.	Cpl. Co. H.	1232	36	40	H
Francis, Benj. T.	Cpl. Co. L.	1764	70	2	A
Fraser, Edward J.	Cpl. Co. K.	1232	22	5	B
Fuller, Chas. L.	Pvt. Co. M.	1764	44	11	A
Gagas, Jas. S.	Pvt. Co. G.	1233	4	13	D
Gardner, Leroy W.	Cpl. Co. C.	1764	16	9	A
Garrant, Henry J.	Pvt. M. D.	1232	20	36	B
Germain, Edward.	Cpl. Co. F.	1764	49	3	A
Gerrion, Arnold B.	Pvt. M. G. Co.	1232	9	42	C
Gerrion, Elroy F.	do.	1232	10	31	D
Gilbert Raymond C.	Cpl. Co. A.	1232	26	36	B
Gokey, Harvey R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	1232	7	34	H
Goldman, Abraham.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E.	1232	39	16	C
Graham, Chester A.	Cpl. Co. M.	1764	59	2	A
Green, Arthur W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1764	58	1	A
Gresik, Josef.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	1232	25	11	C
Guerrin, Earl M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1233	14	12	C
Guthrie, Wm. J. B.	Pvt. Co. L.	1233	20	25	C
Hamilton, Geo.	Cpl. Co. B.	1764	32	13	A
Harnsworth, Fredk. B.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co.	1232	9	14	F
Henderson, John T.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	608	21	19	A
Blanchette, Oscar.	Pvt. Co. G.	1233	10	28	D
Bogan, Chas. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1232	38	24	F
Boisvert, Albert J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1232	28	37	F
Boyle, Chas. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co.	1233	8	20	B
Brisebois, Jos. A. I. (Woods, Rene-alias).	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E.	1764	30	2	A
Brockbank, John C.	Cpl. Co. A.	1232	39	40	H
Buchanan, Matthew L.	Cpl. Co. I.	1233	10	12	C
Buckley, Daniel J.	Pvt. Co. E.	34	20	15	B
Burgess, Leon F.	Bgr. Co. D.	1764	56	4	A
Burrill, Geo. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1764	11	5	A
Carter, Eugene S.	Pvt. Co. C.	1764	32	1	A
Champagne, Alfred G.	Pvt. Co. G.	608	25	27	B
Cinanni, Antonio.	do.	1233	32	12	C
Clark, Donald S.	Cpl. Co. I.	1232	15	2	A
Comeau, Wilbur.	Pvt. Co. F.	1233	13	12	C
Cosma, Chas. D.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	1233	35	24	C
Coombs, Carl L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1232	39	30	H
Howard, Fernald G.	Cook Co. L.	1764	4	4	A
Hoyt, Russell E.	Cpl. Co. E.	1233	36	24	C
Johnson, Oscar Albert.	Pvt. Co. H.	1233	27	8	C
Jusbadone, Andrew.	Pvt. Co. C.	1764	23	1	A
Kehoe, Hugh L.	Pvt. M.G. Co.	1232	7	19	F
Kingdon, Geo. M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K.	1232	37	36	A
Knutson, Charlie B.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	26	27	C
Kocienski, John W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I.	1764	87	1	A
Lachance, Jos.	Pvt. Co. D.	1233	25	16	C
Lacroix, Wm. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. M.G. Co.	1764	55	5	A
Lake, Robt. W.	Pvt. Co. F.	1232	37	41	E
Lambert, John.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	1764	3	4	A
Lavelle, Arthur G.	Pvt. Co. H.	1233	29	7	D
Lavolette, Henry J.	Pvt. Co. K.	608	21	4	A
Leach, Henry W.	Pvt. Co. L.	1233	33	12	C
Lebrance, Angelo.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I.	1764	16	4	A
Longdin, Arthur E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E.	1764	86	10	A
Lord, Ralph J.	Pvt. Co. K.	1764	75	3	A
Marino, Chas.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1764	41	8	A
Martini, Harold W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	608	27	27	B
Martini, Aigelo.	Pvt. Co. F.	1764	15	10	A
Masted, Henry G.	Cpl. Co. E.	1233	28	9	C
McEnelly, Thos. F.	Pvt. Co. K.	1233	36	16	D
McLaughlin, Andrew P.	Cpl. Co. A.	1232	17	4	B
Miller, Carl.	do.	1232	10	44	C
Mills, Paul D.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	608	21	22	A
Moffa, Giuseppe.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B.	1764	25	3	A
Munroe, George.	Pvt. Co. K.	608	23	4	A
Nedean, Herman L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K.	1232	20	27	E
Norsigian, Geo. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H.	1233	26	9	C
O'Keefe, John J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1232	29	37	F
Oliver, Jas. A., jr.	Pvt. Co. E.	1764	26	11	B

1 To be interred.

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 104 INFANTRY—contd.					
Ouimette, Albert.	Pvt. Co. D.	608	24	24	B
Palcolagos, Gregory.	Pvt. Co. H.	1233	9	13	C
Palermo, Tony.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K.	1232	27	39	F
Paradee, Walter N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F.	1764	53	13	F
Pelaz, Jacob.	Musn. Co. F.	608	36	1	A
Peterson, Philip J.	Pvt. Co. L.	1764	33	1	A
Peterson, Wm. A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1764	12	3	B
Petrizia, Erasme.	Pvt. Co. L.	608	27	12	A
Prevost, Harold F.	Pvt. Co. E.	608	25	14	A
Prisco, Wm.	Pvt. Co. G.	1232	10	29	E
Pueschel, Wm. C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	1232	8	42	C
Reed, Samuel Victor.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L.	1764	58	7	A
Robbie, John.	1st Sgt. Co. L.	1232	18	6	F
Rousseau, Albert J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D.	1232	24	42	D
Roy, Chas.	Pvt. Co. K.	1233	25	23	C
Scott, Earl D.	Cpl. Co. L.	1764	62	5	A
Sewell, Loren W.	Pvt. Co. I.	1233	1	12	C
Silva, Peter.	Pvt. Co. G.	1233	27	9	C
Skinner, Fred F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H.	1232	19	22	D
Smith, Wm. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I.	1232	4	8	C
Stewart, Guy.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	1233	9	18	B
Stimpson, Geo. C.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	11	28	D
Stowell, Earle B.	Cpl. Co. C.	1232	27	42	A
Sullivan, Jeremiah F.	Cpl. Co. D.	608	34	1	A
Sullivan, Leo E.	Pvt. Co. F.	1232	1	42	C
Timmmons, Basil A.	Pvt. Co. E.	1233	22	15	C
Tomasko, Tony.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I.	1232	7	10	E
Torosian, Aron.	Pvt. Co. E.	1764	25	6	B
Urquhart, Douglas.	Sgt. Co. D.	(1)			
Upton, Thos. A.	Cpl. Co. B.	1764	22	1	A
Walker, Chauncey D.	Cpl. Co. G.	1764	23	1	B
Walsh, Thos.	Pvt. Co. H.	1764	60	8	A
Williams, Frank E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E.	1233	30	3	C
Wozniak, John.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G.	1232	32	24	B
Young, Reginald.	Pvt. Co. H.	34	7	6	B
Cupples, Lorne L.	2 lt. Co. C, 101 M. G. Bn.	1232	19	6	B
Wellington, Andrew S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 101 M. G. Bn.	608	3	6	B
Lincoln, Clark R.	1 lt. Hq. Co., 102 M. G. Bn.	1764	64	8	A
Allen, Julius P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 102 M. G. Bn.	1764	35	9	A
Anderson, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	10	29	C
Chamberlin, Raymond.	do.	1233	16	29	B
Ditmars, Harry F.	Cpl. Co. B, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	23	25	B
Gordon, Alvin W.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	8	16	C
Gould, Prescott W.	Sgt. Co. C, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	15	8	B
Haldeen, Edwin W.	Cpl. Co. B, 102 M. G. Bn.	1764	64	5	A
Heath, Jackson V.	Cpl. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	29	10	B
Lane, Milton E.	do.	1233	10	19	C
Lundgren, Osborne R.	Pvt. Co. C, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	7	4	H
McKay, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	608	29	11	B
Mieusset, Claude E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	3	38	B
Millican, Leonard L.	Sgt. Co. B, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	36	37	A
Nesbitt, Geo. T.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	13	21	F
Proctor, John C.	Cpl. Co. C, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	4	25	C
Sutermeister, Everett C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	1	2	C
Tolman, Jas. W.	Cook Co. D, 102 M. G. Bn.	1232	13	39	F
Whitelaw, Robt.	Sgt. Co. A, 102 M. G. Bn.	1233	15	21	A
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 101 FIELD ARTILLERY					
Reynolds, Chas. P.	Capt. Hq. Co.	1233	11	9	B
Baker, Arthur E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. F.	1764	29	3	B
Bonyea, Fred.	Wag. Sup. Co.	1233	5	9	C
Broughton, Henry W., jr.	Cpl. Hq. Co.	1233	1	25	A
Chivers, Frank H.	Sgt. Bty. B.	1764	1	2	B
Cunningham, Philip.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A.	1764	69	4	A
Durden, Leonard H.	Sgt. Bty. E.	608	37	28	D
Ellis, Chas. R.	Pvt. Bty. A.	608	13	20	B
Hammond, Chas. F., jr.	Pvt. Bty. C.	608	30	30	B
Hauptner, Chas. F.	Pvt. Bty. B.	608	35	27	C
Hooper, Edward A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A.	608	23	25	B
Joly, Freddy.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D.	1232	10	10	H
Keyes, Wm. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C.	1232	7	35	D
Knowlton, Raymond F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E.	1232	3	37	Q
Lawrence, Davis O.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A.	1233	8	12	C
Leighton, John H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C.	1233	18	13	D
MacPhetres, Hadley M.	Sgt. Bty. E.	1232	6	37	Q
Maks, Edmond P.	Pvt. San. Det.	1764	72	3	A
Murphy, John T.	Pvt. Bty. D.	1764	67	3	A
Peabody, Ellery jr.	Sgt. Bty. A.	1232	7	26	A
Rigby, Herbert E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A.	1233	16	12	C
Sawyer, Enos C.	do.	1233	7	12	C
Schofield, Wm. E.	Pvt. Bty. F.	1232	40	37	G
Smalledge, Chas. L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C.	1764	26	10	B
Spallas, Nicholas.	Cpl. Bty. C.	1764	29	9	B
Tanner, Geo. H.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C.	608	4	12	B
Wardell, Earle.	Cpl. Bty. F.	1764	40	4	A
Williams, Laurence B.	Cpl. Bty. A.	1764	12	5	A
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION, 102 FIELD ARTILLERY					
Basinsky, Alvin R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. B.	1232	37	3	H
Benoit, Geo. L.	Pvt. Bty. E.	34	17	10	A
Bombardier, Louis.	Pvt. Bty. B.	1232	11	40	H
Brosnihan, John F.	do.	1232	20	32	B
Craw, Albert J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D.	608	35	3	A
Dahill, Stephen B.	do.	608	37	28	B
Demers, Alfred J.	Pvt. Bty. E.	1764	57	10	A
Dennett, Mahlon W.	Cpl. Bty. F.	1764	42	5	B
Dyer, Arthur G.	Pvt. Co. C.	1232	14	22	E
English, Robt.	Pvt. Bty. A.	1233	6	16	B
French, Chas. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E.	1233	26	1	D
Frostholm, Neils H.	do.	608	15	3	B

1 Grave 6, Chateau Pereuse Cemetery, Jearre, France.

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION 102 FIELD ARTILLERY— continued					
Gaudette, Jos. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E.	1233	13	23	O
Higginson, Geo.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D.	1232	4	3	D
Hirst, Edward	Cpl. Bty. D.	608	19	19	A
Kelley, Jas. J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D.	1764	75	5	A
Kelly, Cornelius F.	Sgt. Bty. B.	1232	30	43	D
LaBonty, Nestor J.	Pvt. Bty. D.	608	29	3	A
Lawless, Paul H.	Cpl. Bty. B.	1232	7	37	H
Lowry, Geo. N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. B.	1232	12	41	E
Mathison, August	Cpl. Bty. C.	608	35	12	A
Moore, Michael F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. E.	1233	29	11	B
Moore, Thos. N.	Sgt. Bty. D.	1232	34	4	B
Palma, Frank	Pvt. Bty. E.	1233	27	1	B
Rand, Walter A.	do.	608	17	3	B
Rice, Melvin F.	Pvt. Bty. A.	1233	10	23	O
Richardson, Fredk. W.	Mech. Bty. D.	1232	18	35	A
Sandy, Gilbert Y.	Pvt. Bty. B.	1232	10	37	H
Shannon, Thos. F.	Cpl. Bty. B.	1233	29	6	A
Silk, Gerald R. T.	Cpl. Bty. F.	1764	72	6	A
Smith, Franklin O.	Pvt. Bty. B.	1232	2	20	E
Streeter, Chas. M.	do.	1233	11	1	B
Whittles, John	do.	1232	28	20	F
Wright, Winthrop A.	Pvt. Bty. F, 102 F. A.	1233	31	11	B
Ayer, Lawrence S.	2 lt. Bty. C, 103 F. A.	1233	26	24	B
Bacon, Chas.	Pvt. Bty. C, 103 F. A.	1232	29	10	F
Mann, Henry M.	Pvt. San. Det., 102 F. A.	1233	25	4	A
ONE HUNDRED AND FIRST ENGINEERS					
Estey, Harold W.	Major	636	10	29	A
Boisvert, Bernard L.	Cook Hq. Co.	1232	12	22	O
Day, Frederic D.	Sgt. Co. A.	1233	11	12	B
Eaton, Clarence S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A.	1233	30	13	O
Fogg, Cecil W.	Cpl. Co. E.	1764	17	3	B
Forbush, Robt. L.	Mstr. Engr. Hq. Co.	608	32	19	D
Gallac, Emile B.	Pvt. Co. C.	1232	36	20	E
Johnson, Enfred A.	Pvt. Co. D.	1233	8	16	B
Lees, Jas. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C.	1764	57	3	B
McKenney, Rex L.	Pvt. Co. C.	1232	25	46	B
Murray, Russell S.	Pvt. Hq. Co.	1233	1	14	D
Shaw, Walter E.	Cpl. Co. D.	1764	54	5	A
Soper, Otis E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C.	1764	64	8	B
Wilbur, Seamon O.	Pvt. Co. C.	1764	53	5	B
Kopp, Geo. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 101 F. S. Bn.	1764	48	11	A
Monahan, Wm. P.	Cpl. Co. B, 101 F. S. Bn.	1232	18	32	C
Horton, John K.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D. 101 Sup. Tn.	608	22	5	D
Baker, Carleton G.	Cpl. Co. A, 101 Am. Tn.	608	30	35	B
Miller, Geo. H.	Wag. Co. A, 101 Am. Tn.	1233	15	19	D
Randall, Warren A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 101 Am. Tn.	1233	16	19	D
Farnum, Paul J.	Pvt. 101 Amb. Co., 101 San. Tn.	608	23	32	A
Greene, Wm. G.	do.	1764	66	4	A
O'Leary, Frank J.	Sgt. 1 cl. M. D. 101 San. Tn.	1232	38	40	C
Rooney, Owen	Wag. 103 Amb. Co., 101 San. Tn.	1232	35	41	H
TWENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Corsen, Arthur C.	Cpl. Co. H, 107 Inf.	107-E	2	1	B
Fuller, Benj. W.	2 Lt. Co. L, 108 Inf.	636	3	24	B
Moore, Ralph J.	Pvt. Bty. B, 105 F. A.	1232	14	45	D
McLeod, Geo. R.	Pvt. Co. E, 102 Engrs.	636	7	3	A
TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVI- SION					
Austin, Francis Reed.	1 lt. Hq. Co. 109 Inf.	1233	8	28	O
Whitney, Holyoke	2 lt. Co. H, 109 Inf.	1233	28	29	O
Bellini, Guglielmo	Pvt. Co. I, 109 Inf.	1232	4	7	B
Connelly, Eugene F.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 Inf.	1232	17	24	F
Doyle, Richard J.	Pvt. Co. M, 109 Inf.	1232	9	34	E
Fant, Oscar W.	do.	608	24	10	A
Nicholas, Michael	Pvt. Co. G, 109 Inf.	1764	4	7	B
Jackson, Leonard	2 lt. Co. M, 110 Inf.	1764	33	4	B
Kerr, Henry Francis	Pvt. Hq. Co. 110 Inf.	1232	21	19	H
Fiske, Chas. H.	2 lt. 111 Inf.	34	1	10	B
Baker, Isadore W.	Pvt. Co. F, 111 Inf.	1232	17	7	E
Buckley, Wm. J.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 111 Inf.	1232	9	46	A
Chandler, Lester G.	Pvt. Co. H, 111 Inf.	1232	40	25	A
Donvito, Jos.	Pvt. Co. F, 111 Inf.	1232	3	23	B
Gavello, Giovanni	do.	1232	39	24	D
Hurwitz, Max	Pvt. Co. M, 111 Inf.	1232	5	6	F
Larin, Geo. E.	Pvt. Co. K, 111 Inf.	1232	40	42	B
Mullaney, John J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 111 Inf.	1232	36	31	F
Roundy, John A.	Pvt. Co. H, 111 Inf.	1232	34	3	A
Fournier, Louis	Pvt. Co. G, 112 Inf.	1232	22	9	O
Torrey, Kenneth W.	Pvt. Co. A, 108 M. G. Bn.	1232	11	6	D
Blanchard, Jean B.	Pvt. Co. A, 109 M. G. Bn.	1233	23	13	A
Fitzgibbon, Thos. J.	Pvt. Bty. F, 107 F. A.	608	11	13	B
Mafia, Frank J.	do.	608	17	7	O
TWENTY-NINTH DIVI- SION					
Nagle, David J.	Pvt. Bty. B, 111 F. A.	608	23	23	O
Collen, Oscar B.	Pvt. Bty. A, 112 F. A.	608	14	27	B
THIRTIETH DIVISION					
Germain, Henry	Pvt. Co. C, 115 M. G. Bn.	636	8	8	D
English, Thos. J.	Pvt. Bty. A, 113 F. A.	1233	24	11	O
THIRTY-SECOND DIVI- SION					
Wilber, Chas. R.	2 lt. Co. B, 126 Inf.	1232	35	37	B
Hastings, Walcott B.	1 lt. Co. I, 127 Inf.	1232	34	45	O
Hyland, Harold W.	2 lt. Co. F, 127 Inf.	608	16	25	D

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
THIRTY-SECOND DIVI- SION—continued					
Gielarowski, Jos.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. G. Co., 127 Inf.	608	9	21	A
Vegnopoulos, Constan- tine	Pvt. Co. E, 127 Inf.	1232	7	3	F
Chittick, Geo. R.	Pvt. Co. I, 128 Inf.	1232	27	6	H
Framba, Lebere	Pvt. Co. A, 128 Inf.	1232	32	42	B
Hawes, Wales T.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 128 Inf.	1232	29	5	B
Bradley, Thos. J.	Pvt. Co. B, 120 M. G. Bn.	1232	27	42	H
MacDonald, Andrew J.	Pvt. Bty. F, 119 F. A.	1232	24	39	B
McCarthy, Jos. Danl.	Pvt. Bty. C, 119 F. A.	1232	11	32	G
Sheehan, John R.	do.	1232	35	33	F
Toole, Chas. Morton	1 lt. 107 F. S. Bn.	1232	11	20	E
THIRTY-THIRD DIVISION					
Edes, David O. N.	2 lt. Co. E, 131 Inf.	636	15	15	O
Westman, Robt. O.	2 lt. Co. F, 131 Inf.	636	11	14	O
Whitney, Francis W.	2 lt. Co. C, 131 Inf.	1233	35	20	D
Lawton, Hobart A.	2 lt. Bty. F, 124 F. A.	1232	27	13	E
THIRTY-FIFTH DIVISION					
Pickett, Minard E.	Cook Co. I, 138 Inf.	1232	21	16	F
THIRTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Akabas, Maurice W.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 143 Inf.	1232	4	18	A
THIRTY-SEVENTH DIVI- SION					
Miskiel, Frank	Pvt. Co. D, 147 Inf.	1233	6	24	O
Pippl, Pietro	Pvt. Co. G, 148 Inf.	608	36	25	O
FORTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Mickiewicz, Kosty	Pvt. M. D., 161 Inf.	608	34	35	B
Kallianiotis, Wm. A.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 147 F. A.	1232	14	39	O
FORTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Ames, Oliver, Jr.	2 lt. Co. A, 165 Inf.	608	7	3	A
Broderick, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. B, 165 Inf.	1232	40	41	A
Cronin, Patrick J.	Pvt. Co. C, 165 Inf.	1764	37	12	A
Elzear, Jos. A.	Pvt. Co. F, 165 Inf.	1232	32	10	A
Hunt, Homer A.	Pvt. Co. E, 165 Inf.	1232	22	31	F
McCarthy, John T.	Pvt. Co. H, 165 Inf.	608	8	9	B
O'Brien, Matthew A.	Pvt. Co. I, 165 Inf.	608	15	5	B
Palumbo, Tony	Pvt. Co. C, 165 Inf.	1232	36	41	A
Procter, Arthur H.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 165 Inf.	608	2	28	B
Ramsey, Roger R.	Pvt. Co. K, 165 Inf.	608	7	4	A
Romanuk, Michael	Pvt. Co. D, 165 Inf.	608	6	10	A
Salamone, Alfonso	do.	608	11	1	B
Silvia, Miram A.	Pvt. Co. K, 165 Inf.	608	8	6	A
Stokey, Tom	Pvt. Co. I, 165 Inf.	1232	21	15	G
Curtis, Benj. L.	1 lt. Co. F, 167 Inf.	608	15	3	A
Warren, Arthur B.	2 lt. Co. H, 167 Inf.	1232	3	30	H
Wood, Alton P.	2 lt. Co. F, 167 Inf.	1232	33	25	D
Donohue, Dennis F.	Pvt. Co. C, 167 Inf.	1764	19	6	B
Dreier, Chas. A.	Cpl. Co. H, 167 Inf.	1232	25	30	C
Houle, Albert S. J.	Pvt. Co. M, 167 Inf.	1233	10	17	B
McNeil, Bernard L.	Pvt. Co. F, 167 Inf.	1233	3	20	B
Nelson, Geo. M.	do.	1233	28	19	B
Rose, Jos. G.	Pvt. Co. B, 167 Inf.	1233	8	3	B
Rutstein, Benj.	Pvt. Co. K, 167 Inf.	1232	14	43	H
Viola, Benedetto	Pvt. Co. M, 167 Inf.	1233	29	14	B
Gallagher, Jas. G.	Pvt. Co. A, 168 Inf.	1232	32	44	B
Kelly, Wm. P.	do.	1232	15	31	F
Lawler, John R.	Pvt. Co. D, 168 Inf.	1232	32	29	E
Sullivan, Patrick J.	Pvt. Co. F, 168 Inf.	1233	27	11	A
Strong, Glasford S.	Pvt. Bty. D, 151 F. A.	1232	13	22	D
SEVENTY-SIXTH DIVISION					
Henry, David E.	1 lt. Hq. Co. 301 Inf.	608	2	5	O
Finn, Wm. J.	Cpl. Co. H, 301 Inf.	1233	9	26	A
Albro, Arthur Ray- mond	Cpl. Co. A, 302 Inf.	34	5	6	A
Murray, Samuel I.	Pvt. Co. E, 302 Inf.	34	14	13	A
Pescini, Vincenzo	Pvt. Co. B, 302 Inf.	34	10	6	A
Wyman, Horace	1 lt. 303 F. A.	34	30	4	B
Brown, Walter E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. B, 303 F. A.	1764	1	9	B
Plant, Arthur L.	Pvt. Co. E, 301 Engrs.	1233	16	7	O
Holmes, Ralph	Pvt. Co. C, 301 F. S. Bn.	107-E	5	1	B
Gerko, Andrew V.	Cpl. Co. B, 301 Sup. Tn.	636	9	27	B
Wall, Edward R.	Cpl. Co. E, 301 Sup. Tn.	636	4	5	A
SEVENTY-SEVENTH DI- VISION					
Desmarais, Samuel	Pvt. Co. F, 305 Inf.	1232	27	36	B
Donahue, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. H, 305 Inf.	1232	2	30	B
Galinauskas, Constan- tine	Pvt. 1 cl. San Det. 305 Inf.	1232	31	15	H
Giuggio, Pietro	Pvt. Co. C, 305 Inf.	34	22	13	B
Marden, Ray	Cpl. Co. L, 305 Inf.	1232	19	28	O
Moore, Harold A.	Pvt. Co. A, 305 Inf.	608	11	27	O
Spaiteh, Jos. N.	Pvt. Co. F, 305 Inf.	1232	13	5	C
West, Earle T.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 305 Inf.	1232	2	42	F
Barbieri, Andrea	Pvt. Co. A, 306 Inf.	1232	31	32	E
Cloutier, Desire	Pvt. Co. G, 306 Inf.	608	15	5	O
Cooley, Edwin P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 306 Inf.	1764	32	4	B
Coupe, Clarence R.	Pvt. Co. G, 306 Inf.	608	17	5	C
Fudo, Nicodemus	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 306 Inf.	1764	28	13	B
Guerin, Herve	Pvt. Co. I, 308 Inf.	1232	15	23	B
Hogan, Patrick J.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 306 Inf.	1232	24	1	D

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
SEVENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION—continued					
Maynard, Albert C. F.	Pvt. Co. B, 306 Inf.	1232	30	21	A
Newell, John E.	Pvt. Co. D, 306 Inf.	608	28	27	C
O'Connor, Daniel	Pvt. Co. K, 306 Inf.	1232	33	31	F
Tremblay, Jos. August	Pvt. Co. A, 306 Inf.	1232	36	9	C
Walsh, Jas. F.	Pvt. Co. I, 306 Inf.	1232	3	8	A
Yates, Francis J.	Cpl. M. G. Co. 306 Inf.	1232	2	20	C
Zedlis, Geo.	Pvt. Co. C, 306 Inf.	608	28	26	A
Bernardo, Jos.	Pvt. Co. D, 307 Inf.	34	19	16	B
Brown, Peter P.	Pvt. Co. M, 307 Inf.	1764	50	13	B
Carlson, Nathaniel J.	Pvt. Co. A, 307 Inf.	1232	30	21	E
Dupuis, Reno	do.	1232	36	2	E
Hartnett, Wm. F.	Cpl. Co. D, 307 Inf.	1232	11	24	C
Otto, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 307 Inf.	1232	38	42	E
Sand, Julius	Pvt. Co. D, 307 Inf.	1232	21	5	H
Ungvarsky, Wm.	Pvt. Co. F, 307 Inf.	34	7	8	B
Vandenbogaerde, Jos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 307 Inf.	1232	1	6	C
Welch, Peter L.	Pvt. Co. I, 307 Inf.	608	2	2	C
Zukosky, Paul	Pvt. Co. B, 307 Inf.	608	4	34	D
Angier, Albert E.	1 Lt. Co. M, 308 Inf.	1232	9	28	C
Belegon, Geo. S.	Pvt. Co. M, 308 Inf.	608	5	7	D
Carabine, Thos. F.	Pvt. Co. C, 308 Inf.	1232	34	34	H
Carnebucci, Catino	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. C, 308 Inf.	1232	5	12	B
Connolly, Patrick J.	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	1232	33	9	A
Demopoulos, Gust P.	Pvt. Co. G, 308 Inf.	608	15	14	B
Earle, Harold G.	Pvt. Co. I, 308 Inf.	34	13	16	B
Fortune, Jas. W.	Pvt. M. G. Co., 308 Inf.	1232	14	30	H
Higgins, Jas. M.	do.	1232	26	21	D
Keane, Patrick	Pvt. Co. G, 308 Inf.	608	19	27	C
LaScola, Giovanni	do.	608	27	38	C
McTague, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. I, 308 Inf.	608	13	14	B
Meringolo, Carmine	do.	608	14	5	C
Mitchell, Edwin J.	do.	608	14	42	C
Mulrain, Carl	Pvt. Co. D, 308 Inf.	608	18	17	A
Torvisio, Vincent	Pvt. Co. I, 308 Inf.	608	9	24	C
Lincoln, Fred C.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. D, 304 F. A.	608	33	12	D
Quimby, Howard L.	Pvt. Bty. A, 304 F. A.	608	1	27	C
Brule, Norbet J.	Pvt. Bty. D, 305 Inf.	1232	9	42	B
Fisher, Wallace	Pvt. Hq. Co., 305 F. A.	608	7	39	A
Posner, Harry J.	Pvt. Bty. B, 305 F. A.	34	22	5	C
Belain, Geo. L.	Pvt. Bty. B, 306 F. A.	1232	16	9	B
DeFelice, Nicola	Pvt. Bty. C, 306 F. A.	608	23	4	C
Welch, Jas. A.	Pvt. Bty. F, 306 F. A.	1232	33	24	G
Macagno, Antonio	Pvt. Co. A, 302 Engrs.	1764	16	12	B
Parmenter, Wallace A.	Pvt. Co. B, 302 Engrs.	608	9	9	D
Kearns, Elroy S.	Pvt. Co. C, 302 F. S. Bn.	1232	25	12	A
LaForge, Augustus A.	Pvt. Co. C, 302 F. S. Bn.	1232	27	27	G
SEVENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION					
Aubin, Frank	Pvt. Co. G, 310 Inf.	1232	6	18	E
Holmes, Samuel W.	Col. Sgt. Hq. Co. 307 F. A.	608	17	38	A
SEVENTY-NINTH DIVISION					
Woslesky, Daniel	Pvt. Co. G, 313 Inf.	1232	11	29	A
Leva, Anthony J.	Pvt. Co. I, 314 Inf.	1232	27	24	D
McAleer, Dearborn Jos.	Pvt. Co. M, 314 Inf.	1232	21	14	F
Neglio, Jos.	Pvt. Co. C, 314 Inf.	1232	14	29	A
O'Connell, Michael F.	Pvt. Co. G, 314 Inf.	1232	30	27	E
O'Hare, Austin E.	do.	1232	30	3	D
Pelkey, Emery J.	Pvt. Co. K, 314 Inf.	1232	8	35	H
Petitpas, Jos. Alfred	Pvt. Co. E, 314 Inf.	1232	1	25	C
Pickering, Frank E.	Pvt. Co. G, 314 Inf.	1232	29	25	E
Pusepski, Peter	Pvt. Co. B, 314 Inf.	1232	19	21	F
Stavris, Christos H.	Pvt. Co. G, 314 Inf.	1232	28	13	D
Fuerst, Harry E.	Pvt. 1 cl. San. Det. 316 Inf.	1232	3	22	C
Lyford, Thornton	Pvt. Co. E, 316 Inf.	1232	8	3	D
DeGroot, Wm.	Pvt. Co. C, 311 M. G. Bn.	1232	10	41	B
Torpey, Vincent J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. C, 311 F. A.	1232	13	8	C
Alkins, Harry A.	Pvt. 1 cl. 314 Amb. Co. 304 San. Tn.	1232	23	5	D
EIGHTIETH DIVISION					
Morin, Arthur	Pvt. Co. G, 318 Inf.	1232	1	10	A
Ashe, Anthony D.	Pvt. Hq. Co. 319 Inf.	1232	17	4	A
Damien, Henry	Pvt. Co. D, 319 Inf.	1232	38	33	B
O'Brien, Wm. J.	Pvt. Co. F, 319 Inf.	1232	9	8	A
Pedoni, Michael	Pvt. Co. G, 319 Inf.	1232	31	6	C
Romano, Louis	Pvt. Co. F, 319 Inf.	1232	8	23	D
Wolart, Jacob	Pvt. Co. E, 319 Inf.	1232	39	3	B
Finn, John J.	Pvt. Co. C, 320 Inf.	1232	1	26	H
Nolin, Ovila	Pvt. Co. M, 320 Inf.	1232	39	23	B
EIGHTY-FIRST DIVISION					
Prusak, Wladyslaw	Pvt. Co. I, 321 Inf.	1232	30	24	D
Harris, Paul H.	Pvt. M. G. Co. 321 Inf.	1232	18	25	A
EIGHTY-SECOND DIVISION					
Allain, Fred'k.	Pvt. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	7	6	E
Bastille, Henry	Pvt. Co. B, 325 Inf.	1232	6	26	C
Berezniatski, Benj.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	2	29	D
Boldish, Alec M.	Pvt. Hq. Co., 325 Inf.	1232	13	2	B
Callahan, Edward L.	Cpl. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	7	31	D
Clampa, Pasquale	Cpl. Co. F, 325 Inf.	1232	8	7	E
Cinalli, Luigi	Pvt. Co. D, 325 Inf.	1232	2	11	C
Coulombe, Edward A.	Cpl. Co. L, 325 Inf.	34	11	21	A
Cournoyer, Alphonse	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	28	37	A
Crowley, Chas. E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. F, 325 Inf.	1232	32	12	C
Foy, John L.	Pvt. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	3	12	E
Gagne, Fred'k C.	Pvt. Co. K, 325 Inf.	1232	19	46	A
Hamel, Ernest	Pvt. Co. E, 325 Inf.	1232	4	16	D
Higgins, John J.	Cpl. Co. M, 325 Inf.	608	33	32	B
Kennedy, Lawrence F.	Cpl. Co. C, 325 Inf.	1232	3	26	B

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
EIGHTY-SECOND DIVISION—continued					
Leger, Urbain	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	22	29	A
Lowe, Chas. S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 325 Inf.	1232	7	3	H
Marc-Aurele, Noel	Pvt. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	27	7	B
Mathieu, Albert J.	Cpl. Co. I, 325 Inf.	1232	40	13	A
Musante, Augustus	Cpl. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	34	24	A
O'Donohue, Patrick V.	Pvt. Co. M, 325 Inf.	1232	7	1	D
Pelletier, Florein	Pvt. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	29	14	C
Percival, Alban	Pvt. Co. A, 325 Inf.	1232	36	29	C
Regan, Robt. F.	Pvt. Co. K, 325 Inf.	1232	12	33	C
Romez, Jacob S.	Pvt. Co. L, 325 Inf.	1232	17	25	C
Sandquist, Olaf G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. I, 325 Inf.	1232	30	14	C
Savage, Wm.	Pvt. Co. D, 325 Inf.	1232	8	42	H
Tracey, Geo. E.	Pvt. Co. F, 325 Inf.	1232	1	15	A
Bean, Herbert S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 326 Inf.	1232	6	19	G
Cray, Alfred S.	Sgt. Co. C, 326 Inf.	1232	36	13	C
Drummond, Alexandre A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 326 Inf.	1232	28	1	D
Duford, Chas. F.	Sgt. Co. M, 326 Inf.	1232	40	27	E
Fogel, Albert N.	Pvt. Co. E, 326 Inf.	1232	2	11	C
Gasbarri, Giovanni	do.	1232	29	12	C
Hellman, Chas. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 326 Inf.	1232	7	12	A
LaVallee, Albert A.	Sgt. Co. M, 326 Inf.	1232	12	22	H
Martin, Jas. S.	Pvt. Co. L, 326 Inf.	1232	4	31	H
Moore, John R.	Sgt. Co. C, 326 Inf.	1232	25	19	B
Musto, Angelo B.	Pvt. Co. L, 326 Inf.	1232	28	3	A
O'Callaghan, Cornelius	Sgt. Co. G, 326 Inf.	1232	6	12	C
Pagliuca, Frank	Pvt. Co. M, 326 Inf.	1232	18	30	G
Pairadee, Walter W.	Pvt. Co. D, 326 Inf.	1232	12	23	B
Patrell, Erwin E.	Pvt. Co. C, 326 Inf.	1232	12	8	A
Prairie, Geo. E.	Mech. Co. B, 326 Inf.	1232	18	36	G
Soper, Chas. D.	Pvt. Co. K, 326 Inf.	1232	36	11	B
Valsam, Peter	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. G, 326 Inf.	1232	4	1	E
Welch, Earl B.	Sgt. Co. B, 326 Inf.	1232	7	18	B
Woronik, Ludwik	Pvt. Co. D, 326 Inf.	1232	6	24	A
Beausoleil, Albert J.	Cpl. Co. L, 327 Inf.	1232	22	6	B
Boisvert, Stanislas	do.	1232	40	1	D
Cournoyer, Albert	Cpl. Co. E, 327 Inf.	1232	35	6	D
DeBastiani, Ernest	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. H, 327 Inf.	1232	19	3	A
Dumas, Jos.	Cpl. Co. I, 327 Inf.	1232	8	30	A
Dwyer, Jos. G.	Cpl. Co. M, 327 Inf.	1232	30	47	F
Featherstone, Chas. D.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 327 Inf.	1232	1	32	A
Gately, Jas. J.	Cpl. Co. K, 327 Inf.	1232	6	9	D
Goulart, Walter	Pvt. M. G. Co. 327 Inf.	1232	19	32	E
Hobkien, Ross T.	Cpl. Co. E, 327 Inf.	1232	21	26	B
Lillcrap, Geo. E.	Cpl. Co. D, 327 Inf.	1232	21	21	B
Manor, Domino	Pvt. Co. B, 327 Inf.	1232	11	10	A
May, Walter L.	Pvt. Co. F, 327 Inf.	1232	33	2	A
McCabe, Thos. F.	Cpl. Hq. Co. 327 Inf.	1232	33	4	E
Russell, Michael	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 327 Inf.	1232	1	3	A
Tracy, Arthur F.	Sgt. Co. K, 327 Inf.	1232	35	22	C
Vedin, Gunnar N.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 327 Inf.	1232	24	19	B
Veieira, Antone	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. A, 327 Inf.	1232	11	3	E
Baker, Harry	Pvt. Co. G, 328 Inf.	1232	3	35	F
Bourgault, Paul	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. K, 328 Inf.	1232	9	4	E
Cousins, Jacob	Cpl. Co. C, 328 Inf.	1232	20	33	E
Deitalla, Jos.	Pvt. Co. K, 328 Inf.	1232	13	33	G
Dumont, Alphonse	Pvt. Hq. Co., 328 Inf.	1232	36	36	G
Gutowski, Watson	do.	1232	22	24	D
Hegarty, John L.	Cpl. M. G. Co., 328 Inf.	1232	2	29	B
Howard, Everett F.	Pvt. Co. G, 328 Inf.	1232	40	29	A
Kelleher, Fred E.	Sgt. Co. E, 328 Inf.	1232	31	35	F
Kuljavi, Tony	Pvt. Co. I, 328 Inf.	1232	35	19	B
Kuperstein, David	Pvt. Co. M, 328 Inf.	1232	35	35	G
Lebeau, Evano J.	Pvt. San. Det., 328 Inf.	1232	27	16	B
Mooney, John	Cpl. Co. K, 328 Inf.	1232	33	16	G
Rachman, Mark J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. E, 328 Inf.	1232	34	35	H
Sambatoro, Jos. G.	Pvt. Co. L, 328 Inf.	1232	28	29	B
Sands, Maurice C.	Pvt. Co. B, 328 Inf.	1232	31	13	E
Souza, Antone	Cpl. Co. L, 328 Inf.	1232	16	9	D
Starr, Samuel J.	Pvt. Co. I, 328 Inf.	1232	18	26	C
Sylvia, Francis D.	Pvt. Co. H, 328 Inf.	1232	37	16	D
Toole, Albert S.	Sgt. Co. L, 328 Inf.	1232	24	4	C
Vail, Jeffrey	Cpl. Co. F, 328 Inf.	1232	29	23	H
Waring, Fred	Pvt. Co. G, 328 Inf.	1232	18	31	A
Moreau, Chas. K.	Pvt. Co. B, 320 M. G. Bn.	1232	19	46	C
Benoit, Ernest J.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. D, 321 M. G. Bn.	1232	15	10	G
Collins, Wm. J.	Sgt. Maj. Hq. Co., 321 M. G. Bn.	1232	3	11	B
Peabody, Lawrence C.	Pvt. Co. C, 321 M. G. Bn.	1232	12	37	H
Scheffer, Herman H.	do.	1764	32	10	B
Poisson, Arthur	Sgt. Bty. B, 319 F. A.	1232	6	17	B
Reen, John J.	Wag. Sup. Co., 320 F. A.	1232	17	23	H
Beck, Jas. H.	Pvt. Co. F, 307 Am. Tn.	1232	8	7	B
Wisner, Clarence E.	Sgt. Ord. Det., 307 Am. Tn.	1764	21	10	B
Hickey, Jas. J.	Cook, 328 Fld. Hosp. 307 San. Tn.	1232	22	19	B
EIGHTY-FOURTH DIVISION					
Barnum, Frank J.	Pvt. Co. B, 334 Inf.	608	13	34	B
EIGHTY-FIFTH DIVISION					
Triantafylakos, Stavros G.	Pvt. Co. I, 338 Inf.	1232	5	21	C
Frintero, Domenico	Pvt. Bty. F, 329 F. A.	1232	9	8	B
EIGHTY-SEVENTH DIVISION					
Pigott, Richard L.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. L, 347 Inf.	608	29	15	A
Prower, John P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. M, 347 Inf.	608	14	22	D
Sullivan, Jeremiah J.	Pvt. Co. G, 347 Inf.	1232	10	17	A

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
EIGHTY-SEVENTH DIVISION—continued					
Chappell, Raymond E.	Pvt. Co. H, 348 Inf.	34	12	7	A
Chick, Jos. F.	Musn. Hq. Co. 348 Inf.	34	7	22	A
Freeman, Richard W.	Pvt. Co. G, 348 Inf.	34	12	8	A
O'Toole, Jeremiah J.	do.	34	36	10	A
Farrell, John J.	Pvt. Co. A, 312 Engrs.	34	3	5	A
Thivierge, John	do.	34	30	7	A
Walker, Geo. D.	Pvt. Co. B, 312 Engrs.	34	12	2	A
EIGHTY-NINTH DIVISION					
Garvey, Wm. H.	Pvt. Co. M, 356 Inf.	1232	21	21	G
Conway, Wm. E.	Pvt. Co. E, 314 Engrs.	1232	13	12	B
NINETEENTH DIVISION					
Damm, Wm. A.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. Co. 359 Inf.	1233	25	9	C
Davis, Jay S.	Pvt. 1 cl. Mil. Pol. Co.	1232	2	15	H
NINETY-FIRST DIVISION					
Archer, Walter S.	Pvt. Co. C, 316 Engrs.	1232	33	15	F
NINETY-SECOND DIVISION					
Burton, Texas B.	Pvt. Co. C, 367 Inf.	1232	26	33	C
DeWillis, Chas. E. J.	Pvt. Co. D, 367 Inf.	1232	23	29	D
Oliver, Hubert V. J.	Pvt. Co. C, 367 Inf.	1232	23	24	H
NINETY-THIRD DIVISION					
Mason, Clifford B.	Pvt. Co. L, 372 Inf.	1232	35	19	F
Meekies, Clifford K.	Bglr. Co. L, 372 Inf.	1232	26	14	F
Turner, Wm. E.	Sgt. Co. L, 372 Inf.	1232	29	14	H
Wilson, Albert	Pvt. Co. L, 372 Inf.	1232	3	36	G
Washington, Wm. H. C.	do.	1232	17	33	E
Wright, Harrison A.	Cpl. Co. M, 372 Inf.	1232	35	30	F
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS					
Frye, Dean B.	Wag. Co. B, Hq. Bn. GHQ.	608	31	34	B
Thayer, Sanford A.	Sgt. Finance Bureau	34	26	14	B
Brown, Stafford L.	1 lt. Air Serv.	34	23	4	B
Bliss, Carlton M.	2 lt. Air Serv.	107-E	5	3	C
Bullard, Edward L.	do.	1233	19	15	C
Cross, Robt. P.	1 lt. Air Serv.	608	18	28	A
Kissel, Gustav H.	1 lt.	(9)			
Mortimer, Richard, jr.	2 lt. Air Serv.	34	8	7	B
Nathan, Thos. Cushman	1 lt.	(9)			
Kingsland, Edwin R.	2 lt. 8 Aero Sq.	1232	4	25	E
Squires, Geo.	1 lt. SRC.	(9)			
Stiles, Robt. H.	1 lt. 13 Aero Sq.	1233	34	24	B
Beane, Jas. D.	1 lt. 22 Aero Sq.	1232	39	45	B
Clapp, Howard R.	do.	1232	12	27	D
Gardiner, Edward H.	2 lt. 50 Aero Sq.	1233	4	28	C
Dix, Roger S., jr.	Cadet	(9)			
Merrick, Hyde B.	Sgt. 1 cl. 34 Aero Sq.	608	34	9	C
Bruce, Alexander B.	1 lt. 94 Aero Sq.	608	14	7	C
Coolidge, Hamilton	Capt. 94 Aero Sq.	(9)			
Blodgett, Richard A.	1 lt. 95 Aero Sq.	1233	8	19	B
Williams, Bertram	1 lt. 96 Aero Sq.	1233	12	27	C
Hopkins, Stephen T.	2 lt. 96 Aero Sq.	1233	2	27	C
Noonan, Thos. E.	Chfr. 1 cl. 96 Aero Sq.	1233	8	26	C
Hobbs, Warren T.	1 lt. 103 Aero Sq.	(9)			
Putnam, David E.	1 lt. 139 Aero Sq.	(9)			
Pishon, Sturgis	1 lt. 341 Aero Sq.	34	23	4	O
Hartman, Fredk. S.	2 lt. 354 Aero Sq.	1233	18	19	B
Ross, Harrison E.	Chfr. 829 Aero Sq.	608	4	18	A
Leach, Ernest H.	Cadet 2 Av. Instr. Center	1233	19	19	A
Stewart, Gordon	Pvt. 2 Av. Instr. Center	608	8	27	B
Herrick, Wm. F.	1 lt. Hq. Det. 3 Av. Ins. Cen.	1233	24	27	A
Stearns, Wm. S.	1 lt. 7 Av. Instr. Cen.	1764	11	8	B
Morse, Eugene D.	2 lt. 7 Av. Instr. Cen.	1764	33	6	B
Coty, Louis	Pvt. 1 Constr. Co.	107-E	4	7	C
Buck, Paul T.	Sgt. 8 Co. 2 M. M. Regt. AS.	1232	4	27	H
Beaton, Harold	Pvt. 19 Co. 3 M. M. Regt. AS.	34	33	8	B
Watt, Wm.	Pvt. 1 cl. 14 Co. 3 M. M. Regt. AS.	34	26	16	B
Messer, Raymond B.	1 lt. 20 Co. 4 M. M. Regt. AS.	1233	32	6	D
Pfaffmann, John S.	2 lt. Avia. Sec. A. S.	34	10	1	B
Vickers, Albert H.	2 lt. Trn. Det. A. S.	34	10	5	O
Martins, Frank L.	Sgt. 1 Army A. S. C.	1232	32	39	A
Kirk, Jos. P.	Pvt. Bty. E, 42 Art. Regt. C. A. C.	1233	25	14	A
Lund, Hans W.	Pvt. Bty. F, 44 Art. Regt. C. A. C.	1232	35	14	E
McCabe, Thos. J.	Pvt. Bty. C, 44 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	4	28	D
Solomos, Chas. P.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. B, 48 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	1	2	A
McKenney, Karl C.	Capt. Bty. E, 49 Regt. C. A. C.	608	20	31	D
Dobry, Michael J.	Sgt. Hq. Co., 51 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	16	28	C
Solomon, Benj.	Pvt. Bty. B, 52 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	29	14	A

* British military cemetery, Pont-du-Hem, Nord, France.

* Ayr Cemetery, Ayr, Scotland.

* Doune Cemetery, Girvan, Scotland.

* Le Crotoy, Somme, France, Fr. Cmnl. Cemetery.

* Chevieres, Ardennes, France.

* Lafayette Escadrille Memorial.

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—continued					
McDonough, Thos.	Pvt. Bty. F, 53 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	29	27	G
McNiff, Hugh	Pvt. Bty. E, 53 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	24	25	F
Peters, Wm. F.	Pvt. 1 cl. Bty. A, 54 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	4	17	B
Cerrone, Euplio	Pvt. Bty. F, 55 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	35	37	H
Ferson, Edw. John	do.	608	1	39	D
Fortier, Raymond J.	Pvt. Bty. C, 55 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	27	5	D
Guerard, Henry A.	Sgt. Bty. A, 55 Regt. C. A. C.	34	27	8	A
Lynch, Daniel M.	Pvt. Bty. F, 55 Regt. C. A. C.	1764	21	8	B
McGurin, Alfred J.	Cook, Sup. Co., 55 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	29	11	C
Trembley, Paul J.	Pvt. Bty. D, 55 Regt. C. A. C.	1764	29	6	B
Gouger, Patrick A.	Pvt. Bty. C, 57 Regt. C. A. C.	1232	23	34	C
Loughman, Jos. P.	Sgt. Maj. J. G. Sup. Co., 57 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	22	1	A
Costello, Jas. F.	Pvt. Bty. C, 65 Regt. C. A. C.	1233	9	27	A
Horton, Edward	Pvt. Sup. Co., 66 Regt. C. A. C.	34	13	11	A
Flynn, Wm. J.	Pvt. Bty. B, 68 Regt. C. A. C.	34	36	3	A
McCart, Jos. W.	Pvt. M. D., 71 Regt. C. A. C.	608	36	22	D
Newton, Arlo W.	Pvt. Bty. A, 71 Regt. C. A. C.	608	31	30	B
Smith, Jeff M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Sup. Co., 71 Regt. C. A. C.	608	27	30	B
Tucker, John R.	Pvt. 1 cl. M. D., 71 Regt. C. A. C.	608	3	30	B
Flynn, Edward J.	Pvt. Sup. Co., 88 Regt. C. A. C.	34	35	10	A
Coleman, Walter W.	Sgt. 1 cl. Ord. Det., 2 Art. Pk.	1764	22	11	B
Gavigan, Albert H.	Wag. Trk. Co. D, 2 Cps. Art. Pk.	1233	10	27	D
Judge, Thos.	Pvt. 1 cl. Trk. Co. B, 2 Cp. Art. Pk.	1232	15	39	D
Rogers, Chas.	Wag. Co. E, 2 Cp. Art. Pk.	1232	20	3	D
Bowden, Jas. A.	Cpl. Bty. D, 6 A. A. Bn. C. A. C.	107-E	8	6	D
Alvord, Clark	Pvt. 1 cl. Sec. 604 U. S. Amb. Serv.	1233	27	9	B
Fiske, Abram G.	Pvt. 1 cl. Hq. U. S. Air Serv.	34	6	21	A
Hill, Stanley	Pvt. 1 cl. 640 Sec. U. S. Air Serv.	(9)			
Winsor, Philip	Pvt. 1 cl. U. S. Air Serv. 627 Sec.	1232	25	26	E
McMath, Thos. J.	Sgt. Base Hosp. No. 7.	608	33	33	D
Blake, Harold R.	Pvt. Base Hosp. No. 44.	1233	9	18	C
Parrott, Claude J.	do.	1233	13	1	C
Manns, Geo. Wiley	Capt. Base Hosp. No. 79.	608	7	22	A
Davis, Bernard L.	Pvt. Base Hosp. No. 97.	1233	13	23	A
Marron, Jas. F.	Pvt. Base Hosp. No. 101.	608	14	22	A
Woodburn, Fredk. J.	Pvt. Camp Hosp. No. 9.	1233	25	6	D
Martin, John E.	Pvt. 1 cl. Evac. Hosp. No. 8.	1232	24	28	H
Anderson, Chas. W.	Pvt. Vet. Hosp. No. 8.	1764	21	2	A
Roth, Wm. L.	Pvt. Inter. Med. Sup. Dep. 2.	608	8	17	C
Howe, Geo. P.	1 lt. Med. Rev. Cp.	1252	1	4	C
Bailey, Margaret S.	Nurse, Army Nurse Cps. Base Hosp. No. 68.	1233	23	8	B
Fletcher, Lucy M.	Nurse, Base Hosp. No. 6.	34	13	5	C
Malloch, Grace Lee	Nurse, ANCH. H. No. 55.	(9)			
O'Connor, Gertrude	Nurse ANCH. H. No. 7.	608	16	23	A
Larbro, John	Pvt. 1 cl. 238 Mil. Pol. Co.	34	4	2	A
Glennon, Jas. J.	Pvt. 271 Mil. Pol. Co.	1233	34	16	A
Christensen, Christen S.	Pvt. 1 cl. 273 Mil. Pol. Co.	1233	36	26	C
Dineen, Michael J.	Pvt. 1 cl. 295 Mil. Pol. Co.	1233	31	7	A
Cosley, Raymond W.	Pvt. 474 Co. Mtr. Tr. Cps.	1233	8	21	B
Bain, Chas. F.	Sgt. 301 Co. Mtr. Tr. Cps.	1233	34	19	C
Nichols, Chas. J., jr.	Pvt. 488 Mtr. Tk. Co. MTC.	608	5	11	C
Crosby, Alfred D.	Pvt. Det. 11, Gen. Rep. Shop.	1233	27	17	D
Hayden, Edward B.	1 lt. 1 Army Ord. Dept.	34	12	9	B
Tallant, John F.	Pvt. 28 Prov. Ord. Dep. Co.	608	36	13	C
Tureotte, Henry P.	Pvt. 2 Co. Hby. Mob. O. R. S.	1233	7	1	D
Brown, Harry Alfred	Pvt. 1 cl. 1462 Cas. Co.	608	26	38	A
Chase, Chas. W.	Pvt. 380 Cas. Co.	608	7	3	C
Doherty, Edward	Sgt. Co. D, 2 Cav.	1233	28	15	D
Rose, John A.	Sgt. 1 cl. San. Cps. C. W. S.	107-E	4	4	D
Rideout, Percy A.	1 lt. Co. D, 1 Gas Regt.	1232	31	30	G
Ferguson, Frank M. B.	Pvt. Co. A, 1 Gas Regt.	1232	4	33	H
Slamon, Jas. T.	Pvt. Co. B, 1 Gas Regt.	1232	31	9	B
Verder, Walter M.	Pvt. 1 cl. Base Sig. Sch.	608	4	34	A
Plummer, Chas. W.	2 lt. 101 F. A.	608	20	17	A
Wilcox, Frank A.	Colonel, Infantry	608	20	2	D
Pinkham, Harold L.	2 lt. Inf. att. 6 U. S. M. C.	1764	47	9	A
Spencer, Geo. F.	Sgt. Co. I, 3 Pion. Inf.	1232	32	28	E
Doherty, Wm. R.	Cpl. Sup. Co. 4 Pion. Inf.	608	15	31	B
Howes, Wm. A.	Stbl. Sgt. Sup. Co. 4 Pion. Inf.	608	32	22	C
Miller, Max	Pvt. Co. G, 53 Pion. Inf.	1232	21	42	D
Bastian, Fred F.	Sgt. Co. I, 57 Pion. Inf.	608	11	20	D
Johnson, Everett	Pvt. Co. M, 805 Pion. Inf.	1233	1	8	B
Post, Benj. J. C.	Pvt. Co. D, 807 Pion. Inf.	34	28	6	O

* La Veuve, Marne, France.

* French civilian cemetery, Ecrouves, M-et-M, France.

Deceased soldiers from Massachusetts buried in cemeteries in Europe—
Continued

Name	Rank and organization	No.	Grave	Row	Block
NONDIVISIONAL ORGANIZATIONS—CON.					
Taylor, Isaac W.	Pvt. Co. E, 807 Pion. Inf.	608	22	22	D
O'Connell, Wm. J.	Pvt. Off. Chf. Q. M.	608	20	28	A
Smith, Wm. E.	Pvt. Sec. B, Dep. 1, Adv. Animal.	608	2	17	B
Sencabaugh, Benj. F.	Pvt. 316 Fld. Rem. Sq.	1233	6	26	A
Shewalter, Jas.	Pvt. Co. C, 329 Lab. Bn.	1233	40	45	A
McLaughlin, Adrian C.	Cpl. 424 Mtr. Tk. Co.	1233	1	15	A
Farnham, Frank N.	Pvt. 304 Sup. Co. Q. M. C.	608	10	39	D
St. John, John E.	Pvt. Cp. Rochambeau Q. M. C. Det.	608	22	9	C
Higgins, Edward W.	Pvt. 1 cl. 2 Cps. Sch. Q. M. C.	1233	12	8	D
Kaufman, Isadore	Cook 414 Mtr. T. M. Co. Q. M. C.	34	36	4	B
Ginsberg, Benj. J.	2 lt. Bty. F, FW. Art. Repl.	1233	18	1	A
Bourassa, Arthur J.	Sgt. 1 Shop Det. Art.	1233	27	14	A
Cooper, Franklin T.	Pvt. 2 Co. Cp. Devens Repl.	608	5	38	A
Cutting, Frank	Pvt. Cp. Hancock S. R. D. Repl.	608	22	13	C
Fortin, Jerimie	Pvt. 2 Co. Cp. Hancock S. R. D.	608	18	29	B
Howard, Thos.	Sgt. 4 Unit, Cp. Standish S. R. D.	608	29	17	C
Landry, Leo	Pvt. Cp. Devens S. R. D. Hq. Bn.	34	10	18	A
Melanson, Albert E.	Pvt. 6 Prov. Co. Cp. Hancock S. R. D.	608	5	10	D
Glencross, Jas. C.	Sgt. Co. B, 317 Bn.	1232	15	27	B
Proulx, Theophile J.	Pvt. 1 cl. 13 Co. 1 M. M. Regt.	608	7	31	B
Serrurier, Louis	Sgt. 1 cl. Pigeon Co. No. 1, S. C.	1232	28	40	B
Crocker, Alvah, Jr.	2 lt. Engrs.	608	28	21	C
Leary, Edward J.	Pvt. Co. F, 14 Engrs.	1232	19	25	D
McKenney, Everett N.	Pvt. Co. A, 14 Engrs.	636	7	11	A
Parker, Jas. A.	Sgt. Co. F, 14 Engrs.	636	5	32	B
Gravelle, Jas. N.	Pvt. Co. B, 25 Engrs.	608	19	22	D
Thompson, Francis	Sgt. Co. B, 45 Engrs.	608	9	31	A
Shuster, Henry S.	Sup. Sgt. Co. E, 57 Engrs.	608	21	38	A
Irwin, Howard W.	Capt. Co. H, 118 Engrs.	608	15	28	E
Ware, Ernest Alonzo	Capt. Co. B, 506 Engrs.	34	17	8	A
Kammer, Geo. W.	Pvt. Co. C, 519 Engrs.	34	15	6	A
Kelley, Richard G.	Pvt. Co. B, 550 Engrs.	608	4	26	C
Cook, Norman Small	Lt. j. g., U. S. N. R. F.	608	8	26	A
Algar, Philip	Ensign, U. S. N. R. F.	608	22	37	D
Gaskill, David M.	Com. Std., U. S. N. R. F.	608	11	39	D
Ligth, Antonio Luis	B. M. 2 cl., U. S. N. R. F.	608	8	26	C
O'Gorman, Mathew Edw.	Yeoman 1 cl., U. S. N. R. F.	636	10	3	D
Willis, Jas. Henry, Jr.	Ms. Att. 3 cl., U. S. Navy	608	35	30	D
Woodworth, Horace Campbell	Elec. 3 cl., U. S. Navy	608	12	10	C
Jerard, Albert B.	Sgt. Hq. Co., 301 Bn. T. C.	636	11	26	A
Root, Geo. W.	Sgt. Co. A, 303 Bn. T. C.	107-E	7	3	C
Durkin, Wm. R.	Pvt. 1 cl. Co. B, 59 Regt. Tr. Cps.	608	13	8	C
Zarnowski, Wacław	Pvt. 476 Mtr. Tk. Co., 419 Mtr. Sup. Tn.	1233	23	11	B

A CONGRESSMAN'S SERVICE TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, as we approach another recess of Congress our minds should turn to the management of our official affairs during vacation and to making our people a report of our labors here.

At this time I wish to remind the people of my district again that my office in Washington remains open throughout the year for the transaction of business, regardless of the recesses and adjournments of Congress. This office is run for the personal benefit of every individual in the eleventh congressional district of Georgia who has any business with the Government or who in any way needs or desires my services. In other words, I would like to emphasize the fact that as their Congressman I earnestly desire to help them and be of assistance to them in every way possible. I want to be called upon and used whenever and as often as my people desire.

There are hundreds of departmental matters in addition to legislation which a Congressman can handle and does manage gladly. The World War has more than doubled the office work of Congressmen since I was first elected, and this work will increase for the next several years. In all matters either for or against the veterans of the World War or the Spanish-American War I am the attorney and agent of the veteran, never opposing him, but always striving to help him. I regret the United States does not pay a pension to Confederate veterans of the Civil War. I favor not only a pension for them but a fair, general old-age pension. Our Government will in time give proper recognition to our Confederate heroes.

Doubtless many people of my district will desire to avail themselves of the offer of the National Government to provide headstones for marking the graves of Confederate veterans. These stones will not be ready for distribution in the very near future, but I shall be glad to furnish application blanks to those interested, and upon their return to me handle the same with the War Department.

The longer I stay in Congress the more I am determined, so far as possible, to keep the people of my district advised of just what is taking place in Congress. I believe every Member should take decided stands on every important issue, should vote on all matters, and should make speeches and place written statements in the RECORD, letting the world know his convictions on the issues that arise here.

The House membership being nearly five times as large as that of the Senate, each Member of the House must content himself with about one-fifth of the time used by Senators in debate. I find, though, that a Member can get reasonable opportunity to discuss on the floor the matters in which he is most interested. The very best Members make speeches on the floor; also carefully prepare written arguments and briefs and file them, by unanimous consent, for printing in the RECORD just like lawyers do when handling an important case before a judge or the higher courts. All who have studied the proposition know that the very best arguments in Congress, in the courts, and elsewhere are those that are carefully prepared and reduced to writing. The good Member of Congress, like the able lawyer, does both. He makes a speech when he thinks that is best, and prepares a written statement when he believes that is best under the circumstances.

The honest Member of Congress not only makes known his position to the Congress but perpetuates his ideas so that all future generations may know just how he felt about various matters that arose during his term of office. If his argument is good, it may be the cause of proper legislation in future years. He may lose temporarily, but later the fruits of his labor may become the heritage of all men. What a man says on the floor of Congress at best is heard by only a few people and would soon be forgotten if not recorded. What becomes part of the permanent RECORD will last as long as our Government and if our Government should fall will still be read by countless millions as long as the ages roll. No man with the welfare of his people at heart will permit thousands upon thousands of pages of RECORD to be filled with fallacious statements by the enemies of his folks without himself using every known legitimate method of recording his objections to and protest against this vicious propaganda and thus perpetuate for all time his honest views and reasonings in behalf of the people he represents.

It is the duty of each Member to have printed and mailed to their constituents such speeches and remarks as may be necessary to keep their folks fully advised as to their work in Congress. Our people are entitled to reports from time to time in order that they may know whether we are doing their work efficiently and honestly. Contrary to what many people believe, Members of Congress pay for the printing of the speeches they mail out to their constituents. Those of us with average districts who each year send out several speeches spend each for this purpose a thousand or more dollars per year.

I am so thoroughly convinced of these things and that a Member should stay in Washington on the job that I have never missed but one record vote, except in case of sickness which absolutely prevented my attendance upon the sessions of the House. I missed one record vote deliberately. I was handling a matter at a department which meant life or death, and while I knew about the vote and the matter involved, I was determined to stay at the department and do my best there rather than cast a vote where it would not at all change the result.

I know many Members of the House and many of the State legislatures who miss more record votes in a day than I have missed in over 10 years, when they have no excuse other than a show, a baseball game, or a game of golf. Many of these men are able and honorable, but I just could not be at all satisfied if the House was in session with me away, either at a game, on account of business, or any other cause, except, of course, providential hindrance. Since my people intrusted me with the sacred duty of representing them here I have never been away from Washington while the House of Representatives was in session.

Thus it is that I have been in actual attendance upon the Congress all the while and have always taken sides by debate or otherwise. No business of mine nor any other personal excuse, except providential, has ever kept me from attendance upon a session of the House for even a few minutes, or kept me from the fullest and most complete discharge of my duties as a

Member of Congress. One of the happy thoughts concerning my service here is that my record for attendance is so nearly perfect as not to be subject to any honest criticism by friend or foe, and that this is not a matter of hearsay but a matter of actual written permanent record.

I am not boasting. I feel no one should brag about doing his plain duty. I am simply making a report to my people, just as any other man should make a report of his labor and services to his employer. I have always endeavored to represent first, last, and all the time the people of my district. Since most of my people are farmers and all my people are dependent upon the farmers for support and success, I find myself considering the farmer as my main constituent. I came back to Washington a month before the first day of the special session so that I could keep in touch with the committees which were whipping into shape the bills to be introduced as soon as Congress convened.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry listened to me at length, and I thank the chairman and his committee for the courteous hearing accorded me and for the many inquiries made by the members during the course of my remarks. I also made a short statement before the House committee, as that committee had heard me at length during the Seventieth Congress and the hearings of the past Congress were adopted as a part of the recent hearing. I have had both these statements on farm relief placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and hope to have them and the several speeches made by me during this session printed in pamphlet form and mailed to all the voters in my district. I shall do this because I believe it is right and because I want my people to have a chance to see whether or not I am doing their work as they would have it done.

I have some very definite ideas on the subject of farm relief. I did not get the bill passed which I believe would be best for the farmers. There was passed, though, a much better bill than the ones passed by the last Congress and the prior Congresses. Many of the things which several of us opposed in the other bills were left out of the present bill. The measure which passed the House has been made much better in the Senate and the bill which went to the President and was signed by him is, in my mind, the best farm bill that ever became law.

I have heretofore discussed most fully the major bills of this special session and will not now enter upon an argument of the tariff and the so-called "farm relief" bill. There are so many things that should be done for the farmer and the common people. They do not get a square deal as to freight rates, tariff, taxation, marketing, or any other matter. As I have repeatedly said, unnecessary middlemen should be eliminated, and the Government can and should help the farmer to name the price of what he sells, like other folks, and give him the same freight rates and tariff and export debenture protection as is enjoyed by others.

Some say the great burden of the common people—local taxation—can not be remedied by Federal legislation. It can be solved fairly by a constitutional amendment providing, in effect, that no tax of any nature can be collected out of home or farm property except from the value of the property after deducting all recorded liens. If a farmer owns a farm worth \$5,000 and owes a mortgage against it for \$4,000, he ought to pay taxes on one thousand and not five thousand dollars. This privilege is enjoyed by the banks and corporations, why not by the farmers? I have introduced a resolution to provide for this amendment to the Federal Constitution.

Congress can help the farmers if it ever decides to do so. We should quit playing politics and endeavoring to put each other in a hole and get the farmers of the Nation out of their present awful condition. Those here who are playing politics are only putting themselves in bad and injuring the farmer and the people of the whole Nation.

ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OF WAR JAMES W. GOOD

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the address of Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War, at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party, delivered at Ripon, Wis., on the afternoon of June 8, 1929.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, under consent given me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the address of Hon. James W. Good, Secretary of War, at the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Republican Party, delivered at Ripon, Wis., on the afternoon of June 8, 1929.

The address is as follows:

FOUNDING OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY

When I accepted the invitation for this occasion, I did not know that I was doing something that entitled me to recognition as a tremendously courageous individual, but I know it now. Within a few days after it was announced that I would appear on this platform and occasion, I received letters from at least half a score of other thoroughly documented birthplaces of the Republican Party, all telling me, in terms that ranged from mild amusement to positive acerbity, that I was giving my countenance to a dreadful historical error.

My friends at Jackson, Mich., were positively amazed that anybody should indulge in so egregious a blunder. A newspaper from western New York recorded the indignation of the little town of Friendship, where, as all intelligent people were supposed to know, the Republican Party first saw the light of day and received its christening. From Bloomington, Ill., came a caller who, more in sorrow than in anger, assured me that I was the victim of misplaced confidence, while my friends from Pennsylvania, with a tone of lofty superiority, gave me to understand that Ripon could not flinch that crown from the serene, if slightly smoke-grimed brow of Pittsburgh. "Why," declared one ardent Pittsburgher who has a particularly good speech on the subject, "you are proposing to steal from me my one most effective classical allusion, that in which, with perfect certainty that it will always draw a big hand anywhere in Allegheny County, I point out that even as Minerva sprang full-panoplied from the brow of Jove, so the Republican Party as a national force sprang from the Pittsburgh Republican conference of February 22, 1856." I ventured that maybe he could shape up a new and most serviceable classical reference on the basis of the Greek legend that Homer, dead, was claimed by seven cities. He brightened for a moment, but then shook his head. "No," he protested, "I'm not skillful enough to work out a parallel between a poet as dead as Homer and a political party so vigorously alive that it carried 40 States in the last election."

Since accepting your invitation I have been moved to some special examination of the claims advanced by various communities and movements in connection with the beginnings of the Republican Party. There are plenty of places which insist that the honor belongs to them. Numerous gatherings, conferences, and more or less formal conventions were held in whose behalf claims are put forth, but the fact seems to be that the great movement which brought the Republican Party into existence was truly a popular one. It was not a program which leadership handed down to the masses of the people. Rather, whoever reads the history of the years 1854, 1855, and 1856 must be impressed with the popular character of that movement. It came up, literally, out of the ground, everywhere, in response to a country-wide demand from the people, and it became a movement which the masses handed down to leaders in public thought and political action.

All the way from New England and New York, out to Illinois, Missouri, and Kansas, in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Pennsylvania, and in other States, earnest men held small and great gatherings, which at the time must have seemed to bear little relation to one another, and less of common purpose. Yet, looking back over the records they left, we find convincing evidence that they did represent a singleness of purpose, a unity of motive, which no individual leadership could have inspired, but which only could have come out of the moral consciousness of a great people genuinely aroused.

Some men who afterwards attained national leadership, participated in these earliest manifestations of popular acclaim. Some of those realized that the Nation confronted a real crisis and that a new weapon must be forged wherewith to fight the battle for national unity. But these men had not yet become national leaders; many, indeed, who had already reached positions of importance in the world of politics, feared and distrusted the new movement, lest it break down old alignments and leave them without followers.

The people, beginning to realize the gravity of conditions which the country faced and the menace which those conditions involved, were resolved to brush aside the pettiness of partisanship, the selfishness of place holders, the selfseeking ambitions of men, who, having their feet already on one ladder, feared that, in leaping to another they might lose their places. The people, aroused and terribly in earnest, had no sympathy for such mean motives. Their ambition was not to gain something, but to save everything. So it is characteristic of the time and the state of public opinion that such a gathering should have been brought together as that which, here in Ripon, on February 28, 1854, has come to be historic and to command the reverence that is attested by this splendid gathering in its honor.

The men who with high resolve came to the Congregational Church at Ripon on February 28, and who 20 days later, on March 20, came to this little white schoolhouse in Ripon, represented all parties, all factions, all strata of their community. They did not realize that they were making history; they would have been overcome with stage fright if they could remotely have imagined this gathering, three-quarters of a century later, to pay tribute to their work. They came together,

conscious of no further purpose than to do, on behalf of one frontier neighborhood, the simple but obvious duty of good citizenship.

In an effort to set at rest the claims as to the birthplace of the Republican Party, the Republican National Committee, in 1924, issued the publication: *The Republican Party—A Brief History*, from which I quote:

"One of the first meetings was held in the Congregational Church at Ripon, February 28, 1854. A resolution was adopted pledging those present to sever their allegiance from old political parties in case the Kansas-Nebraska bill passed, and organize a new one to be known as the Republican Party. The bill passed the Senate and a second meeting was called at Ripon by Maj. Alvan Earle Covay, this time in the schoolhouse. This was the first systematic work performed to bring about a fusion of the antislavery parties in the North into one organization."

This rivalry for the distinction of a great party's nativity presents some aspects that are worth examining. We shall hear a good many claims advanced in this diamond jubilee year of Republicanism to the honor of starting the party in the world. But let us bear in mind that while the party has more than an ample supply of birthplaces, no nationally known man has ever been accorded the distinction of being its founder. Fremont, who became its first candidate, added no meaning to it. He was from the ranks of those volunteers who arose to meet the challenge of the hour for a party that would express the human needs of a people passing through a crisis. Quite inevitably, when we think of the beginnings of the old Federalist Party, we think of Hamilton as its founder. Likewise, Jefferson is credited with the genius that established the earlier Republican Party; and rugged old Andy Jackson with the sturdy leadership which transformed it into the Democratic Party of the middle and modern epochs.

While we can trace our party's ancestry through the Whig and Free Soil Parties, the abolition agitation, and a number of lesser political movements, nowhere do we find a great nationally known figure as the founder of the Republican Party. Truly that party sprang from the people.

Here at Ripon, a man peculiarly typical of the times and the movement had issued the call which brought together a goodly number of the citizens of this community on February 28, 1854. He was Alvan Earle Bovay. In a time when many similar gatherings inspired with the same broad purposes were being held throughout the country, Father Bovay fixed his claim to future distinction, not as the chairman of a caucus, but rather because his seems to have been the inspiration which not only called that first meeting but also suggested the name of the new party. It was a tremendously important contribution, and for the purpose of this place, this day, this occasion we may safely dismiss the claims of some equally enthusiastic localities and accord the credit to him as the founder and to Ripon as the birthplace of the Republican Party.

Bovay, a young lawyer of Whig antecedents, had, at the time of this meeting, been a citizen of Wisconsin four years, coming to the State from New York two years after Wisconsin's admission to statehood. His early association in New York with Horace Greeley, the great orthodox Whig editor of the New York Tribune, together with his natural leanings to reform movements having for their purpose the advancement of the cause of workingmen, peculiarly fitted him for the local leadership he assumed in bringing together the men who here held the first public meeting of the new party.

If there was to be a new party, there must be a name for it. The name must be, in a measure, descriptive; it must suggest principles and objects; it must be comprehensive of what the founders hoped for the Republic under its new leadership; it must be attractive, for, as eager reformers have repeatedly learned, it requires a good many people to make an effective political party. The name "Republican" precisely fitted all the conditions. It was instinct with the genius of American institutions. It had come from eminently respectable lineage. It was exactly descriptive of the sort of organization that was wanted. In short, it was a good name, and from the day it was adopted here in Ripon down to this hour when we return for a ceremony of consecration, it has maintained, without fear and without reproach, the honor of a good name.

Let us consider for a moment the events which called our party into being, molded its declaration of principles, and turned over to it the helm of national affairs. For many years prior to 1854 the country was governed by an oligarchy of slaveholders. The common people had but little voice in shaping the policies of the Government. The great masses of the people were, by this aristocracy, denominated the "mudsills" of society. The repeal of the Missouri compromise opening up the entire territory of the Government to the institution of slavery, not only sounded the death knell of the Whig Party but was the bugle call summoning the common people to the christening of the new party.

It was a heterogeneous mass that 75 years ago stood at the cradle of the Republican Party. There were Whigs and Democrats, Free Soilers, Know-Nothings, and Abolitionists. From all that was good in these, it selected the best, both in principles and men.

The new party was obliged to take the added responsibility of leadership in a nation enjoying prosperous days. The message to Congress by President Pierce asserts that every part of the country was prosperous to a degree before unknown; that railroad systems were extending their lines in every direction; manufacturing was developing; the whirring of the spindle was to be heard in almost every village, hamlet, and town. Commerce was at high tide. There was a ready market for all and more than we could produce. Prices were remunerative. Excepting that of slaves, labor found ready employment and at a good wage. Our population was rapidly increasing. The National Treasury was full to overflowing. Yet in the face of this overwhelming prosperity, with that peculiar responsibility with which prosperity burdens continuous leadership, the organizers of the Republican Party demanded that the spirit of the Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, wherein was guaranteed equal rights to all and special privileges to none, should become a living reality. These new leaders took apart the sordid partnership, which cotton and commerce had builded, and translated human suffering and bondage into a human cause.

In our first declaration of principles, we invited the affiliation and cooperation of men of all parties, who believed in the principles of Washington and Jefferson, and asserted that the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution, are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States, must be preserved.

In our platform of 1860, we reaffirmed our faith in the doctrine of equal rights for all and of special privileges to none.

Again in 1868 our platform declared:

"We recognize the great principles laid down in the immortal Declaration of Independence as the true foundation of democratic government; and we hail with gladness every effort toward making these principles a living reality on every inch of American soil."

In 1876 we again wrote in our platform "that all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, among which are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness; that for the attainment of these ends governments had been instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed. Until these truths are cheerfully obeyed, or, if needs be, vigorously enforced, the work of the Republican Party is unfinished." It is thus seen that the Republican Party was founded on the doctrine of equal rights to all, special privileges to none.

That party, in championing needed reforms, has often espoused other principles, but they always have been based on the doctrine of equal rights. That doctrine has been the mast from which have been flown minor banners; it has been the trunk from which has grown smaller branches, but in all the 75 years of the party's magnificent history that doctrine has been the touchstone of Republican legislation and Republican administration.

From the opening hour of the party, born so humbly here, the response had that mighty power that always accompanies popular conviction in a critical moment. In the election of 1856 the new party elected 15 Members of the United States Senate and 108 Members of the House of Representatives. When that Congress met a year later the Republican membership was strong enough to elect Nathaniel P. Banks as its Speaker, thus beginning a control of that body which lasted for an unbroken period of 20 years.

In the exciting years that followed the party gathered strength, and with vision and patriotism it mapped out a program which time and events proved to be of the highest wisdom and statesmanship.

The party won its first national victory in the memorable campaign of 1860. Fortunate for the future of the Republic, and of the world, was its choice in that great crisis, of such a leader as Abraham Lincoln. Endowed beyond all others with peculiar genius and ability he proved equal to the emergency and demonstrated the prowess to cope with the approaching storm. When he was inaugurated President there was laid upon his shoulders the greatest burden that mortal man was ever called upon to bear. At the end of four years of deadly strife it was settled for all time that the United States was a nation, one and indivisible, and not a mere federation of States. Human slavery had been abolished, and the nations of the earth received a new lesson in the cause of justice and human rights, a lesson which has been a powerful factor in the moral progress of the world. But of even greater benefit to mankind was the determination of that larger fact so eloquently expressed by the immortal Lincoln that "Government of the people, by the people, and for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

When the conflict ended we were challenged by the immediate need of binding up the Nation's wounds; of finding relief not only for those who had borne the burden of the conflict for the Union but likewise for those who had surrendered. The gage of battle had determined that we were still to be one people. If Lincoln had lived to serve out his second term, the delicate task of reconstruction would doubtless have been performed in less time than that required by his successor, and certainly with greater patience, justice, and statesmanship. Doubtless his great nature would have led us into a more sympathetic reali-

zation of the problems of the South; into a wiser conception of the moral stewardship of the southern people created through the sudden emancipation of the slaves.

A policy never satisfactory to the southern people brought just reproach to our party in the South. However, the years that have seen the mellowing of the rancors of the war have seen a mighty progress—economic, industrial, and spiritual—in both the North and the South. Many of our differences have found reconciliation. Our interests have merged; the gratifying evidence came to us in the recent election that future political problems are to be less sectional. The growing appreciation by southern people of the national policies of the Republican Party lays upon us an added obligation to be worthy the new consideration that has been given to our party by southern voters.

This is an occasion to survey the events and evolutions that mark the milestones in the history of the Republican Party. Even the most facile genius in description must hesitate to attempt portrayal of the sweeping changes in political conditions, in modes of life and habits of thought that have overtaken the world in this brief span. There are men here to-day who have lived through it all, who have seen compressed into the space of seven decades the events of such a social, economic, scientific, and intellectual evolution as has not been paralleled in seven centuries from any other span of history. They have seen our country, our continent, advance from an outpost of civilization to become the very citadel of its present power—the repository of its hope for the future. They have witnessed the Republican Party standing at all times for those things which were sane, reasonable, practical, progressive. They have seen it stand for national faith and credit when there was temptation in some quarters to repudiate national obligations. So to-day we may take stock of our present-day affairs and consider by what policies and through what leadership has the country reached and maintained its present high state of prosperity, contentment, and well-being.

To recount correctly the great achievements of the Republican Party, or to point out the successive steps of our national advance and assign to the party its true place in that progress are alike impossible in the time allotted me to-day. Permit me, however, to enumerate briefly some of the great political principles for which the party steadfastly has stood, and to the adoption of which our national progress and advance is in no small degree responsible.

If the test of the party's capacity for leadership and government is measured by its accomplishments in the field of Government finance, in the exercise of the taxing and spending powers of Congress, then we must conclude that the Republican Party was fully and splendidly equipped to solve the momentous and complex problems that have demanded attention during a period of the most colossal growth and expansion any country ever experienced since the beginning of time. The close of the Civil War left the country with a national debt of \$2,755,000,000. The party assumed the burden, not only of reconstruction, but of the prompt and orderly discharge of all its obligations and the maintenance of the national credit.

With virility and force the party has met the specious pleas that have been advanced by our adversaries to lower our standard of money. Successive Republican administrations have stood unflinchingly for the cause of sound money and for an unquestioned national credit. It established our monetary system on a firm and sound basis when it provided for the redemption of greenbacks in coin and courageously resumed specie payment.

It demanded that our obligations should be faithfully and promptly redeemed at par. It raised the value of our paper currency from 38 per cent to the par of gold; it restored upon a solid basis payment in coin of all national obligations, and gave us a currency absolutely good and equal in every part of our extended country; it lifted the credit of the Nation from the point where 6 per cent Government bonds sold at 86 to where 4 per cent bonds are eagerly sought at a premium.

Twenty years later it took an equally determined stand for the maintenance of the gold standard against a combined assault of powerful groups which sought to debase the country's currency through the free and unlimited coinage of silver. It created the national monetary commission, whose reports form the basis for our present banking and currency system.

It placed on the statute books of the Nation a national budget system that has stood the test of postwar reconstruction, and as Burke put the old Latin law: "It gave us a system of economy which is itself a great revenue."

During the 48 mighty years that ended in 1913, Government revenues exceeded expenditures by approximately \$1,700,000,000, notwithstanding that during that period we executed the greatest engineering feat ever performed by any country—the construction of the Panama Canal, at a cost of \$386,000,000. In 1913, when the administration of Government affairs was turned over to Democracy, our national debt had been reduced to \$1,193,000,000. During all those years less than six hundred and forty millions of direct taxes were levied and collected, for our revenues came from the Republican system of indirect taxes which the ordinary citizen did not feel and which did not affect industry, except to stimulate production.

Eight years later, after the World War, when Warren Harding became President, the country, still technically at war, was staggering under the burden of heavy taxes, a national debt of approximately \$24,000,000,000, and unliquidated outstanding war claims aggregating many millions more. By several successive acts of Congress, advocated by President Harding and President Coolidge, Congress lightened the burden of taxation by removing Federal taxes entirely from those who were least able to pay them and making enormous reductions for all classes of our people. Notwithstanding these tremendous reductions in taxation, a Republican administration during the past eight years has reduced our public debt by almost \$7,000,000,000. Here is an incomparable record of efficiency and accomplishment for all time, for all parties, and for all peoples.

And what shall we say of its policy as related to industry? Have our legislative and administrative policies been constant and progressive or have they been changing and wavering policies, calculated only to catch votes? In the beginning the party proclaimed its faith in the policy of protection and from that day to this, a protective tariff policy has been our beacon light, guiding the Nation to an industrial supremacy that has been the wonder and admiration of the world. That policy, advanced for the interests of labor and capital alike, is responsible for the high standards of living enjoyed by our wage earners and for a fair return on capital invested in industrial pursuits.

For years the Democratic Party opposed the policy of protection, denouncing it first as unconstitutional, then as economically unsound, and finally as a robbery. Only in the last election did it admit that it had been wrong for more than half a century on the policy of protection, thereby admitting that on that issue the Republican Party had been everlastingly right. Even to-day, while professing advocacy of the policy of protection, the Democratic Party would deny the country the benefits of that policy by withholding the practical application of it.

In conformity with its early pioneer spirit, the new party gave to the pioneer and the settler a national homestead law, opening up the vast stretches of our western Federal domain for the homesteader and the farmer. When in later years we witnessed the passing of that great economic condition, the availability of free lands in the rain belt, it became necessary to embark on a program of reclamation of lands in arid and semiarid regions to meet the demands of our expanding population for homes in our national domain. Again in this great movement the Republican Party championed the cause of the pioneer and brought about the enactment of a law under which vast areas of public lands in our western country were made available. Those were quickly settled by sturdy citizens, who soon transformed that wilderness into a succession of happy homes, productive farms, and prosperous communities.

In its lifetime of service to a growing nation no economic accomplishment ranks higher than the establishment of rail communication. National activities were retarded by lack of adequate means of transportation. A great inland empire slumbered because no magic wand of communication stirred its drowsiness. Finally, in spite of powerful opposition, the Republican Party secured Federal aid for the building of the Pacific Railroad, by which our middle western empire was given an opportunity to develop its population and production, to cultivate its lands, and to build its homes and its cities.

The party, from its beginning championed the cause of agriculture. It stood not only for free lands, for reclamation, and for transportation, but also for regulation of freight and passenger rates, first through State and then Federal commerce commissions; for free postal delivery service; and for meat inspection. To-day it stands for an improvement of our inland waterways, in order to provide cheaper transportation of grain and bulk commodities, and for legislation providing for a sound and orderly system of marketing farm produce to the end that the American farmer may look to the future with confidence that his industry may gain a parity with that of industrial groups.

The Republican Party from the day of its birth has constantly stood for free labor and the right of labor to improve its condition and accumulate a competence. Practically all of the so-called social or welfare legislation protecting labor of women and children in industry was initiated, perfected, and enacted into law in Republican States and by Republican legislatures, and in a national way, such legislation has been sponsored and enacted by Republican Congresses.

In all its history, the party has remained true to the best American principles and American traditions. In all its eventful career it never has found it necessary or even expedient to abandon a national policy because it was unsound or un-American. To-day it may take just pride that its policies have been vindicated repeatedly by the verdict of the world's greatest jury—the American electorate.

Standing alone, these and hundreds of other outstanding measures and policies for which the party is responsible, are comparatively meaningless. Translated in terms of real progress, standards of living, and comforts of life, they make the most brilliant and thrilling history of the advance of any people. It is an incomparable record of achievement for all time and for all people. In that brief span our population of 28,000,000 increased to more than 120,000,000. Our national wealth

grew from 7 billions to more than 420 billions of dollars, and our per capita wealth increased from \$250 to more than \$3,500. The value of the product of our factories and neighborhood industries increased from one and one-half billion to more than \$60,000,000,000. The value of our exports increased twentyfold, while our exports of agricultural products increased from \$160,000,000 to more than \$2,000,000,000. Bank deposits increased fifteenfold and railway mileage increased from 30,000 to more than 250,000 miles. Wages of farm hands increased from \$10 per month with board to \$40 per month, while labor in our factories and building trades multiplied five times.

With these increases have come broader opportunities and increased comforts to every home in the land. Look for a moment at the life we live. Visit the home of the average citizen and compare his mode of living, the comforts, aye, even the luxuries he enjoys with the prevailing conditions in our country in 1856; yes, compare it with the mode of living of the average citizen of any European country, and in the quiet of your home, in the innermost consciousness of your own hearts, ask the simple question: "Has the party that has been in power during all but 15 years from 1860 to this present hour given the country a healthy, forward-looking, progressive administration of public affairs?" Your conclusion must inevitably be that it has kept the faith of its founders.

Nor have we been actuated alone by considerations of material growth and expansion. Our party has given constant thought and earnest endeavor to legislative action for moral and civic betterment. It recognized our Indians as wards of the Government. It enacted the law prohibiting white-slave traffic. It placed on our statute books the pure food and drugs act; legislation by which agricultural colleges were endowed by grants of land from the public domain; and legislation that gave to the womanhood of America the great privilege of citizenship—the right to vote. It produced legislation safeguarding childhood and home life. All this was done with a singleness of purpose so to advance human welfare that the comforts and joys of our American life might more and more become the common enjoyment of all. Legislation having for its object the amelioration of the conditions and environments surrounding those who work in factory and in mill; laws affecting hours of labor, minimum wage, child labor, occupational diseases, sanitary conditions, workmen's compensation, are of Republican origin and for a time were to be found only in States having Republican legislatures.

During the 75 years of its history it has maintained a strong, consistent American policy, standing steadfastly and consistently for those great principles of government that have assured the prosperity and contentment of our people. It never has varied in its adherence to the cause of sound money. It never has failed to advocate the policy of protection to the extent of providing tariff duties covering the difference in the cost of production at home and abroad. Its dealing with other peoples has been statesmanlike and constant. Its foreign policy has been fair, just, and sound. Our country has gained well-earned recognition in the great family of nations.

As a result of the war with Spain, for the first time we became a colonial power. Bidden to establish a colonial policy to accord with our political principles, there began almost immediately to take shape a type of control which has astonished the world and which has been the source of improvement in the colonial policies of other nations. We made of Cuba, for whose freedom we went to war, a neighboring Republic. Under the leadership of McKinley and Roosevelt we took a subject people and made citizens of them. In the Philippine Islands, whose inhabitants for 300 years had paid tribute to Spain, we established a representative autonomous government. Though wisely led by an American governor general, authority largely is vested in a legislature composed entirely of Filipinos. Into these islands we carried order, sanitation, good health, free public education, and a prosperity that makes the Philippine Islands an envied spot in Asia.

The Republican Party always has stood four-square for American labor and for the American home, advocating the enactment of welfare legislation to improve our standards of living and American home life. These same forces which from the beginning operated to make and keep the Republican Party truly representative of the best interests of all the people, operated to make and keep it a truly progressive party. With its progress has meant more than gratification of the personal ambition of any man or group of men within its membership. For it to be progressive was to give the broadest construction to the doctrine of equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

In the 68 years since the Republican Party first came into power all of the major policies of American foreign relations have been determined and shaped by Republican statesmen. The brilliant diplomacy of the American Civil War, the preservation of Mexico for the Mexicans, and the purchase of Alaska, were Republican measures carried out by William E. Seward.

The treaty of Washington which not only laid the basis for the *Alabama* claims arbitration, but laid also the basis for an Anglo-American understanding of vast moment at the end of the century, when the United States wished to build and operate the Panama Canal, was negotiated by a Republican Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish. It was

James G. Blaine who inaugurated the movement for closer understanding with the Latin-American States of which the Pan American Union is the visible expression and of which the recent treaties of conciliation and arbitration between the Pan-American States are the most recent fruit. It was McKinley, Sherman, and Day, Republicans all, who brought the Nation through the dangerous shoals of 1898, and it was McKinley, Hay, Roosevelt, Taft, Root, and Knox who swung the ship of state over into a new and hitherto uncharted course in American foreign policy. The acquisition of Hawaii, Porto Rico, and the Philippines, and the construction of the Panama Canal were giant strides in American foreign relations.

It is not too much to say that after Theodore Roosevelt left the White House there remained for succeeding administrations but to apply and adapt foreign policies which had already been worked out in principle and tested. No new principle of policy was introduced in the World War, and it is to be observed that while the Wilson administration at first showed a disposition to reject some of the foreign policies which had been its legacy from the Taft administration, nevertheless before the eight years of Democratic administration were concluded its only foreign policies which had been approved by the country at large were those which at length had been borrowed from the administrations of McKinley, Roosevelt, and Taft.

Under the brilliant leadership of Charles Evans Hughes there was called the Washington conference of 1922, one of the most important events, not only in American history, but in the history of all modern international relations.

It became the duty of the Republicans to make peace with Germany and thus formally to conclude the American part in the World War, and to the Republican Party has been intrusted the tasks of leading the American people through the tangled web of war-debt settlements, and the momentous question of reparations. Nor is it proper to conclude this brief reference to the Republican Party and American foreign policy without mention of the fact that the Kellogg multilateral pact for the renunciation of war gathers up all that is best in the best traditions of the foreign policies of every nation and bids fair to inaugurate between states a new era of international comity and understanding.

The high rank in statesmanship of our Republican Presidents has won the plaudits of patriotic men and women adhering to other political creeds. The record of their brilliant achievements makes a most thrilling story of the great human advance in an age of marvelous development and accomplishment. The immortal Lincoln, great emancipator and savior of the Union. The intrepid Grant, great in war and great in peace, initiating reform of the civil service and maintaining the national credit. Hayes, formulating financial policies resulting in a marked revival of business and prosperity. The martyred Garfield, holding office for only a few months but winning the confidence and affection of all our people. His successor, Arthur, bringing to a completion the construction of three of the great transcontinental railway systems. Almost a quarter of a century of unbroken Republican rule under these men as Presidents witnessed a great advance in the prosperity of our country and the well-being of all our people.

In later years Harrison reduced the public debt, arranged numerous treaties of commercial reciprocity with other countries of the Americas and Europe, and brought about a restriction of immigration which kept from our shores the mentally and physically unfit. The beloved McKinley, whose administration elevated the United States to a great world power, established the Nation's finances on a sound-money basis and provided an adequate protective tariff. His strenuous successor, Theodore Roosevelt, who inaugurated the mammoth undertaking of building the Panama Canal and thus uniting the Pacific and the Atlantic Oceans, and who inaugurated a necessary regulation of trusts and monopolies. Taft, the present Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, gaining in the admiration and esteem of the people with every passing year, whose administration established the postal-savings bank, reformed the judicial system, and inaugurated the parcel post.

Then Harding, who established peace with Germany, successfully restored the Republic to a peace-time basis, formed the Bureau of the Budget, restricted immigration to its actual needs, and called the world conference on the limitation of armaments. And Calvin Coolidge, whose wise and far-seeing economies in governmental administration so influenced the industrial life of the Nation that under his leadership the Republic continued to enjoy an era of unexampled prosperity.

The mere naming of these illustrious men, whose administrations brought honor, credit, and prosperity to the Nation, brings to mind numerous events and achievements rich with accomplishment.

With the most popular demonstration ever witnessed by our people we have just chosen a new President. Humanitarian, statesman, great engineer, his public accomplishments have marked him as peculiarly fitted and worthy to carry on the great work so well begun. With constant growth of the Nation have come greater problems. We must find solutions to important questions relative to agriculture, commerce, foreign relations, and development of natural resources; but at the same time we must insure equal rights to all and special privileges to none. Fitted by native ability and world training in humanitarian endeavor, President Hoover brings to the American hearthstone and

preside the highest ideal in our American life with the earnest hope that the good things of life may more and more become the common enjoyment of all.

In this presence and on this occasion I make no apologies for my Republicanism. I always have been a Republican, a believer in its principles, an advocate of its doctrines, and a supporter of its candidates. What I claim for myself is the exercise of an American right to choose my own political party, a right which I would not, if I could, deny to any citizen of the Republic. Political parties are human institutions and can not be perfect. Mistakes have been made in the past. They will be made in the future, and one of the highest privileges and duties of the citizen is to affiliate himself with a political party and help in a constructive way to make his party fully fit and numerically strong so as to permit it to perform its greatest service.

Whether we fully recognize it or not, the fact remains that the 2-party system in America has come to stay. It is the strength of democratic government. In no other practical way can an electorate in a republic become informed as to the merits of political issues or the fitness of candidates for political office. Nothing is more fallacious than the idea that a party exists for the benefit of the officeholder or the politician. To survive, a party will live only upon the worthiness of its principles. History is strewn with the wrecks of parties organized by ambitious men for their personal advancement, which demonstrates that no party in a democracy can long exist that is not responsive to the will of the people.

No democracy can achieve a great degree of constructive statesmanship without the service of a political party aiding the elector in the wise decisions the people alone must make. Throughout the ages the civilized people of the world have found political parties indispensable. A few years ago an independent political movement of some importance started in this Middle West, having for its purpose the securing of legislation for the farmer and the laboring man. That movement was heralded throughout the country as one independent of all political parties, but no sooner had it gotten under way than it organized a political party known as the Non-Partisan League, which practiced the most intense partisanship in its efforts to bring about the legislation urged by its founders.

I find myself in sympathy with patriotic lectures recently made by the Hon. John W. Davis, the Democratic candidate for the Presidency in 1924, before the students of Princeton University, in which he makes a strong appeal for 2-party government. Manifestly the country is best governed when there exists two strong political parties divided solely on great political and moral issues, the one always a check and a balance on the other. It is the high duty of every citizen to perform his fullest mission in making his party responsive to the people's will.

It is a proud claim which Ripon asserts—this claim to be the birthplace of the Republican Party. It entitles you to an especial share of the glory which illumines one of the great epochs in the Nation's history. From the hour of that modest christening here at Ripon 75 years ago the name which you gave to the party has been emblazoned on the banners of every good cause, every sound program, every movement for the Nation's welfare and humanity's betterment. It has been borne aloft by the soldiers of freedom in the noblest wars that liberty has waged in both hemispheres. It has come to stand for wisdom in counsel, courage in execution, and justice in all the increasingly complex relations of the individual man to the society in which he lives.

To a noble, a patriotic, and a humane program you gave a name that almost instantly was accorded universal acceptance. You sent it forth to the Nation consecrated to a noble cause, armed and armored for a great strife. That strife was destined to justify the national boast that here had been founded in deed and in truth the home of the free.

Such was the name you gave us; such the cause to which you consecrated it. To-day we bring it back to you, unsullied and untarnished, with pride in the record of accomplishment for which it stands, asking no more than that here to-day it will be rededicated to many more generations of such service as it has in the past symbolized.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. DENISON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent if the House is in session to-morrow that I may have 15 minutes to address the House after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

PROHIBITION

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for six minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

Mr. GARNER. Under my agreement with the gentleman from Connecticut I am compelled to ask the gentleman on what subject?

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. On the subject of why there is lawlessness.

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, I want to read into the RECORD an editorial from the Sheboygan Press of June 13, 1929, entitled "Why There Is Lawlessness."

WHY THERE IS LAWLESSNESS

Are the law-abiding people of the United States to be placed in the same category with the gangsters of Chicago and other cities? Will the Government continue to pursue a policy of shooting innocent people, thereby placing itself in a class with the gangster?

These are questions that the Government must answer to the people of these United States sooner or later. We know that there are open violations of the liquor laws, that there is rum running on the border; but this does not justify the enforcement officer in taking human life unless absolutely certain of guilt, and linked with this, that his (the officer's) life is in danger.

The Chicago gangsters have been shooting one another for the last several years, ever since prohibition became the law of the land, and no one has seriously objected. We have recognized the fact that if these gangsters wanted to shoot one another in beer wars that was, perhaps, a good way to lessen this undesirable population. Then again, the greater number of them were foreigners who had indicated very little respect for our laws at any time. Even in the face of all this gangster warfare the protecting arm of the Commonwealth of Illinois and other States has been thrown about the murdered person.

Here is another picture, and this, too, has been created as a result of prohibition. Admittedly the country is infested with rum runners, bootleggers, and individuals of that stripe. Each year finds the situation more grave and tense, with the Government trying to outlaw liquor by prohibiting it. In this new picture you see a group of enforcement officers armed with sawed-off guns just like the gangsters use in their Chicago warfare, and these are used, not for self-preservation but for aggression, as has been demonstrated during the past 12 months.

Under an order from the Government, commands to halt and failure to respond, invite shooting at the tires of an automobile. Not all of these Federal officers are marksmen, and some of them are cowards who lose their heads and don't know whether they are firing at a tire or the top of an automobile. This was the case near International Falls, Minn., where an American citizen, journeying along the highway with his wife and two children, was assassinated by an agent of the Government. This cowardly official, Emmett J. White, said to be a marksman of ability, called upon the occupants of the car to stop, and the evidence of the wife was to the effect that the shooting commenced immediately. That car was riddled with bullets and not a single tire was hit.

You have here two pictures, one of gangster warfare with the officers of every Commonwealth ready to prosecute to the end that there shall be no killing and on the other hand, one of the innocent killing of men, women, and children, and the United States of America refusing to accord to them the rights that a gangster gets. Is this fair play? Is this American justice? Is this the protection the Constitution framers had in mind? Because this country has bank bandits and rum runners and other disreputable citizens, would the police of the country be warranted in shooting at every citizen they saw? How long would a police department last if it had a White, if it had a Smith, or if it had some others of the type that have shot and killed innocent people? How long would a policeman carry a star and be recognized by a fire and police board if he resorted to murder, when his department was created with the idea of outlawing murder?

Can you blame the people of Illinois for threatening the deputy who killed Mrs. De King? Could you blame the people of Minnesota if they were to resort to force as a result of the killing of Henry Virkula, of International Falls?

If we as a government sanction murder, if we deny protection to those who have a right to ask it under the Constitution, then this Government is deteriorating, law and order become a mere plaything, and the moral fiber of the Nation is broken. No typical American, no individual who loves his country and his flag, can stand idly by and allow a condition of this kind to exist without protest. From every pulpit in this country, from every rostrum, and from every city and hamlet there should go out a protest against such ruthless murder.

The United States is employing as enforcement officers a group of men many of whom have violated the laws themselves. They are gathered from every conceivable nook of this country. Some of them are discarded and discredited detectives. Others are politicians who have seldom worked or been even a partial success in their home community. They are given a gun and are told to do things that a self-respecting citizen would refuse to do. They get into the good graces of some new-made friend, or they employ minor girls to accompany them to roadhouses and violate the law themselves in order to apprehend some other law violator. This is the type that is doing the shooting.

A system like this can not succeed; the Government can not afford to have an army of prohibition officers on its pay roll unless they are respecters of the law themselves.

We contend that every American citizen is entitled to protection. If Henry Virkula had been shot and killed on the border by a Canadian

official, or if he had been in Mexico and was murdered under similar circumstances, this country would go to war in order to vindicate the cause of liberty and the ideal that an American citizen is entitled to protection, whether at home or abroad, as long as he is living within the law. What is the United States of America going to do in this particular case? Are we going to whitewash, to say that Mr. Virkula should have stopped immediately when he was ordered to, or are we going to hush this matter up? Yes; we would go to war, and rightfully so, in defense of any American citizen who was ruthlessly murdered by a foreign nation.

President Hoover has called a commission to study the whys and wherefores of crime. Here is one of them—the biggest outstanding point that we can raise. When homes are invaded, when American citizens are shot down in cold blood, then the Constitution is trampled under foot, and law and respect for law become a football, kicked at will. If we are going to have respect for law, then the Government itself must show respect for its citizens.

C. E. BROUGHTON, *Editor.*

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEATHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have been a Member of this House for more than eight years. I never have addressed the House upon the subject of prohibition and I do not intend to do so now. I rise to make an observation or two for the benefit of those who seem to be so much concerned about law enforcement. As I understand it, a criminal charge has been lodged against the prohibition officer involved in the shooting of one Wirkkula on the Canadian border. I also understand that that case has not yet been tried. It seems to be that, as Members of this House, we could well afford to abide our time and let the orderly processes of the law take their course. [Applause.] After the trial of that case then it may be time to offer criticisms, but until that time no man who has had anything to do with the enforcement of law ought to presume to judge and pass upon the case.

I want to make one other observation, and in doing so I may be pardoned for a personal reference. I shall not address myself to the merits of prohibition one way or the other, but a few years ago, in the discharge of official duties committed to my hands by the people of my judicial district, it was my duty to prosecute more than 1,500 criminal cases, ranging all the way from murder to petit larceny. My records show that in 90 per cent of those cases the defendants and their friends denounced the law under which they were being prosecuted, and every time a peace officer dared to stand between their lawlessness and the peace and safety of the community, that officer was denounced in the most scathing terms by the defendants and their relatives, and, I am sorry to say, in many cases by the attorneys who defended them.

TARIFF HEARINGS

Mr. BEERS. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged report from the Committee on Printing, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 15

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That in accordance with paragraph 3 of section 2 of the printing act, approved March 1, 1907, the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, empowered to have printed 1,000 additional copies of the consolidated hearings held before the committee relative to "tariff act of 1929" during the current session.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution was agreed to.

THE DEBENTURE PLAN

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the export debenture plan by inserting therein a statement by the secretary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, Mr. Steward.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the consent just given, I extend my remarks by inserting the following statement on the debenture plan of farm relief, by Mr. C. B. Steward, secretary of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation:

The operation of a debenture plan will not accomplish the purpose claimed by the proponents, but may work a hardship on both the producer and consumer in the end.

In order for the debenture plan to be operative, the product must be exported. It would not be put in operation until the price decline would be below what the producer should receive. Oftentimes it would be

caused by seasonal marketing or a bear influence on the market by gamblers and speculators. At such time it would not be known what caused the price decline. At such times there may not be an amount in excess of domestic requirements. To operate the debenture plan at such times would remove from the country products that may be needed later to supply the domestic requirements; and because of such removal before another crop could be produced—and the shortage naturally caused by such removal—the price may rise to a very high level at the end of the year at a time that a very small per cent of the product would be in the hands of the American producers, and would naturally cause a very high price to the consumers. And further, may cause the importation of the product over the tariff wall, which would be to the expense of the American farmer and the consuming public.

In the operation of the debenture plan what assurance would the American farmer have of getting the benefit of the debenture or the part to which he would be entitled? The broker that handles it would get his share; the exporter would evidently get his share; and the local grain dealer would evidently try to get a share. There would be a tendency on the part of the exporter and the debenture broker to bear the price in order to force the operation of the debenture plan so that they might profit by its operation. What would happen to the Nebraska farmer is best illustrated in the mechanical process of marketing wheat. When the harvest starts and the combines begin to move, wheat flows to the terminal market of Omaha by the trainload.

The exporter is not in the market at that time. The wheat must be bought and placed in storage, or must be retained by the cooperator and stored for future resale. Nobody knows, not even the operator in the terminal market, what the possible export demand will be. Hence, even though he may have the potential advantage of the 21-cent debenture on export wheat, the possible extent to which he will be able to use the debenture, and the possible demand on the part of the importer for the debenture is so uncertain that he dare not bid the farmer even a reasonable proportion of the amount indicated on a debenture certificate. So that 90 per cent of the farmers' grain moves in and is sold without any reference to the possibility of increased price through the securing of debenture certificates on exportable surplus; and then, later on during the winter season, the exporter comes to Omaha to buy ten or twenty million bushels of wheat. Inasmuch as there is an exportable surplus of two hundred or three hundred million bushels, the exporter is not going to bid the full extent of the possible debenture certificate which he may receive because he does not have to do so to get the wheat, but he may make a possible bid of 5 or 6 cents, depending upon whether or not his competitor in the export business is after the same wheat, which would hardly be probable. Neither would he dare bid the full 21-cent premium indicated by the debenture certificate, because he knows that the importer is not going to pay par for the debenture certificate. The price which he will receive for the debenture certificate as a negotiable instrument will depend entirely upon the possible demand by the importer.

Now, importers will not be anxious to secure debenture certificates unless there is a material advantage. It would be far less trouble for them to pay the cash, unless they can save considerable money in the purchase of debenture certificates below par. So this is another uncertain element which will not permit the producer to receive even a reasonably small part of the premium indicated in a debenture certificate; but in the meantime we assume that the importer has secured all of the debenture certificates that he needs in his business at a discount. There is no restriction as to the character of goods which he proposes to import, so he takes his debenture certificates, which he has purchased at a discount, and offers them at par to the Government in the payment of import duties on New Zealand beef or Australian wool; thus coming into competition with the Nebraska farmer who not only produces wheat, in the sale of which he receives only a small part of the price advance which the debenture certificate would indicate and that small advance he lost in competition with the importer of New Zealand beef, who was able to pay the duty on the basis of the face value of his debenture certificate which he bought at a discount and, in effect, receive a bounty as an importer to the extent of the difference between the discount at which he bought the debenture certificate and the amount of duty imposed upon the imported beef. It will be readily seen that such a system would leave the producer of agricultural products in Nebraska in a far worse condition than he is in to-day. The farmer would be the last to come in and may get a small part of it—but, in any event, the Government would lose the full amount of the debenture.

Many times we have price declines that seriously affect the market caused by various reasons when we do not have an exportable surplus. Under the operation of a Federal farm board with commodity stabilization corporations they could enter the market at such times as the price decline would affect the price to the point that they decided that the producer was not getting what he was entitled to (the same as they would to enforce the debenture plan), and remove from the market channels a sufficient amount of the product to influence the price raise (the same as would be the object of the debenture plan), but the product would be for distribution at such times as it would be needed for domestic requirement.

Should there be evidence at the end of the year of an exportable surplus, the board could make such disposition of the surplus as it deemed advisable, by carrying over a part or sell in export. Should there be a loss in so doing, it would not be likely that it would cost the Government as much to stand the loss out of the revolving fund as it would to operate the debenture plan. The American producer and the American consumer would be assured of a stabilized price for both the raw material and the finished product.

In the practical marketing of grain, exporters naturally desire to expand their operations and in the world markets they of course would like to increase the volume of business that they can do. Now, then, knowing that on every bushel of grain that he exports he would receive a debenture certificate which would possibly net him between 15 cents and 20 cents per bushel on every bushel that he exported, he would naturally use this advantage in making favorable offers of wheat to buyers on the foreign market. If the Argentine or Australian exporters wanted to sell wheat, he would have to meet this condition. You can plainly see how the American exporter would have the advantage of 15 cents or 20 cents which he expected to realize from his debenture certificate in underselling his competitor on the world market. The net result would be to lower the price on the world market due to this influence and if the American price is based upon the world price the final result would be a reduced price to the American producer.

There is nothing to compel the exporter to pass the advantage of the debenture back to the producer. The most natural thing in the world for him to do is to increase his volume of business by making a more attractive offer to the foreign buyer.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 7 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, June 18, 1929, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

34. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting report from the Chief of Engineers on preliminary examination and survey of Norfolk Harbor, Va., with a view to enlarging the channel in the Eastern Branch of the Elizabeth River (H. Doc. No. 37); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

35. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Federal farm board for \$151,000,000, to be immediately available, for commencing operations under the provisions of the act entitled "The agricultural marketing act," approved June 15, 1929 (H. Doc. No. 38); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. McLEOD: A bill (H. R. 4015) to provide for the revocation and suspension of operators and chauffeurs' licenses and registration certificates; to require proof of ability to respond in damages for injuries caused by the operation of motor vehicles; to prescribe the form of and conditions in insurance policies covering the liability of motor-vehicle operators; to subject such policies to the approval of the commissioner of insurance; to constitute the director of traffic the agent of non-resident owners and operators of motor vehicles operated in the District of Columbia for the purpose of service of process; to provide for the report of accidents; to authorize the director of traffic to make rules for the administration of this statute; and to prescribe penalties for the violation of the provisions of this act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4016) making an appropriation to carry out the provisions of the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. CABLE: A bill (H. R. 4017) relative to the naturalization and citizenship of married women; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. GASQUE: A bill (H. R. 4018) for the relief of dependents of officers of the Federal Government engaged in the enforcement of the national prohibition law; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4019) to amend section 501 of the act approved May 19, 1924, entitled "World War adjusted compensation act," providing for the payment of a certificate upon certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAUGEN: A bill (H. R. 4020) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to investigate and report to Congress on the advisability and practicability of establishing a national park to be known as the Upper Mississippi National Park in the State of Iowa, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 4021) to accept the grant by the State of Montana of concurrent police jurisdiction over the rights of way of the Blackfeet Highway, and over the rights of way of its connections with the Glacier National Park road system on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation in the State of Montana; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. LETTS: A bill (H. R. 4022) to authorize the Chief of Ordnance of the War Department to submit bids for the furnishing of equipment, materials, and supplies, and the performance of work for agencies of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PALMISANO: A bill (H. R. 4023) to amend section 641 of the act approved May 19, 1924, entitled "World War veterans' relief," providing for the payment of a certificate upon certain conditions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 4024) for the hospitalization of persons discharged from the United States Navy or Marine Corps who have contracted tuberculosis in the line of duty while in the naval service; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4025) to prevent the use of stop watches or similar devices in the Postal Service and guaranteeing to postal employees their lawful rights; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: A bill (H. R. 4026) to amend paragraph (c), section 2, of Public Law No. 952, Seventieth Congress; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 111) designating September 8 as national marine memorial day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FISH: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 112) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States for a referendum on war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred, as follows:

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, relating to the repeal of the national-origins provision of the Federal immigration law; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. BACHMANN: A bill (H. R. 4027) granting an increase of pension to Melissa L. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4028) granting an increase of pension to Kate Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BAIRD: A bill (H. R. 4029) granting a pension to Grace Hagan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4030) granting an increase of pension to Rosella Facer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 4031) granting a pension to Tony Flynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BOWMAN: A bill (H. R. 4032) granting a pension to Daniel M. Dice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4033) granting a pension to Cyrus Harman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4034) granting a pension to Mary C. Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4035) granting a pension to Jane Mallow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CAREW: A bill (H. R. 4036) granting a pension to Henry Meyers; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHASE: A bill (H. R. 4037) granting a pension to John Jesse Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARKE of New York: A bill (H. R. 4038) granting a pension to Julia Gleason; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 4039) for the relief of Charles F. Gray; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EATON of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 4040) granting an increase of pension to Christian White; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HICKEY: A bill (H. R. 4041) granting a pension to Julia A. Collett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4042) granting an increase of pension to Martha Jane Smurr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JONES of Texas: A bill (H. R. 4043) granting a pension to Thomas M. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOZIER: A bill (H. R. 4044) granting an increase of pension to Nannie J. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 4045) granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Hopper; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4046) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLIGAN: A bill (H. R. 4047) granting a pension to America B. Halcomb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4048) granting a pension to Martha E. Noble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4049) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Edwards; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FRANK M. RAMEY: A bill (H. R. 4050) donating trophy gun to F. D. Hubbel Relief Corps, No. 103, of Hillsboro, Ill.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANDERS of New York: A bill (H. R. 4051) granting an increase of pension to Henrietta B. Sheffield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER: A bill (H. R. 4052) for the relief of Greiling Engineering Co., of Green Bay, Wis.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4053) granting an increase of pension to Sarah Sanderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4054) granting an increase of pension to Lena Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 4055) to authorize a cash award to William P. Flood for beneficial suggestions resulting in improvement in naval material; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SHREVE: A bill (H. R. 4056) granting an increase of pension to Harriet Laddy; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALKER: A bill (H. R. 4057) granting an increase of pension to Minerva Henderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WELSH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 4058) granting a pension to Mary A. Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD: A bill (H. R. 4059) granting an increase of pension to Keturah H. Grismer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

669. Petition of San Francisco Funeral Directors Association, opposing a tax on earned incomes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

670. By Mr. BOYLAN: Resolutions of Yorkville Chamber of Commerce, of New York City, recommending repeal of national-origins provision of immigration law of 1924; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

671. By Mr. KIESS: Petition from citizens of Lawrenceville, Pa., favoring the passage of general pension legislation; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

672. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of Washington Camp, No. 827, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Fredericktown, Pa., in support of the Robinson bill for a department of education; to the Committee on Education.

673. By Mr. SNOW: Petition signed by 93 citizens of Milo, Me., urging the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps at the special session to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill increasing the amount of pension to Civil War veterans and their widows as follows: \$72 per month for every Civil War survivor, \$125 per month for every Civil War survivor requiring aid and attendance, \$150 per month for veterans totally blind, and \$50 per month for every Civil War widow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

674. Also, memorial of William McKinley Camp, No. 17, of Bangor, Me., urging passage of House bill 2562 and Senate bill 476; to the Committee on Pensions.

675. Also, petition signed by 85 citizens of Blaine and Mars Hill, Me., urging the Congress of the United States to take immediate steps at the special session to bring to a vote a Civil War pension bill increasing the amount of pension to Civil War veterans and their widows as follows: \$72 per month for every Civil War survivor, \$125 per month for every Civil War survivor requiring aid and attendance, \$150 per month for veterans totally blind, and \$50 per month for every Civil War widow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE

TUESDAY, June 18, 1929

(Legislative day of Monday, June 17, 1929)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Mr. JONES. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Allen	Fletcher	La Follette	Simmons
Ashurst	Frazier	McKellar	Smith
Barkley	George	McNary	Smoot
Bingham	Gillett	Metcalf	Steck
Blease	Glass	Moses	Steiwer
Borah	Glenn	Norbeck	Swanson
Bratton	Goff	Norris	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Goldsborough	Nye	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Greene	Oddie	Townsend
Burton	Harris	Overman	Trammell
Capper	Harrison	Patterson	Tydings
Caraway	Hatfield	Pine	Tyson
Connally	Hawes	Randsell	Vandenberg
Copeland	Hayden	Reed	Walcott
Couzens	Hebert	Robinson, Ark.	Walsh, Mass.
Cutting	Heffin	Robinson, Ind.	Walsh, Mont.
Dale	Howell	Sackett	Warren
Deneen	Johnson	Schall	Waterman
Edge	Jones	Sheppard	Watson
Fess	Kean	Shortridge	Wheeler

Mr. FESS. The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] is unavoidably absent from the Senate. I will let this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. HEFLIN. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Alabama [Mr. BLACK] is necessarily absent on account of illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR FRANCIS E. WARREN

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, on Thursday, the 20th of this month, a distinguished and much beloved Member of this body will celebrate his eighty-fifth birthday, and I know that every Member—Democrat, Republican, and Farmer-Laborite—will rejoice and join me in wishing for the able senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] many, many happy returns of the day.

Senator WARREN has had a notable career. He was born in Massachusetts, and, when he was 18 years old, enlisted in the Union Army, and thereafter had a distinguished military service. He was given the congressional medal of honor for gallantry in action at Port Hudson. Shortly after the war he moved to Wyoming, and no man has ever taken a more active part in the affairs of any State than Senator WARREN has since that time taken in the affairs of Wyoming. From time to time he was a member of both houses of the Territorial and State legislatures, mayor of the city of Cheyenne; he was appointed Territorial Governor of Wyoming by President Arthur, and afterwards reappointed by President Harrison. When the State was admitted into the Union he became the first governor of the State by vote of the people. He was then elected to the United States Senate, on November 18, 1890, and with the exception of two years, when there was a deadlock in the legislature and no one was elected, Senator WARREN has been Senator from that State ever since.

This birthday of Senator WARREN brings to mind his long service. Senator WARREN has served in the Senate of the United States longer than any other man who was ever a Member of this body. On the 20th of this month he will have served 36 years 6 months 28 days, longer by more than a year than anyone else who has ever served.

Next to Senator WARREN in length of service was William B. Allison, of Iowa, who served 35 years and 5 months.

Only 11 Senators, all told, have ever served as long as 30 years. It will be interesting, I am sure, to know who these are:

FRANCIS E. WARREN, of Wyoming, 36 years 6 months 28 days.

William B. Allison, Iowa, 35 years 5 months.

Justin S. Morrill, Vermont, 31 years 9 months 24 days.

Henry Cabot Lodge, Massachusetts, 31 years 8 months 5 days.

John Sherman, Ohio, 31 years 7 months.

William P. Frye, Maine, 30 years 4 months 20 days.

John T. Morgan, Alabama, 30 years 3 months 7 days.

Shelby M. Cullom, Illinois, 30 years.

Eugene Hale, Maine, 30 years.

Francis M. Cockrell, Missouri, 30 years.

John P. Jones, Nevada, 30 years.